

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, February, 1893.

## THE TENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

OF THE

*Modern Language Association of America.*

THE Tenth Annual Convention of THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA met in the halls of the Columbian University in Washington on the morning of December 28, 1892, and held its sessions during the three days following. The last two conventions have been held in Washington, and, from their success, it seems wise that it has been decided to hold the next meeting there also.

The subjects of the papers at this meeting were of great interest and variety, extending over a large field of modern languages.

The President of the Association, Professor Francis A. March, of Lafayette College, Pa., called the Convention to order. President J. C. Welling, of the Columbian University, extended on the part of the University a welcome to the Association. After reports by the Secretary and the Treasurer and the appointment of committees, Prof. J. W. Pearce, of Tulane University, La., read the first paper.

"Did King Alfred translate the *Historia Ecclesiastica*?" was the question discussed by Prof. Pearce. The differences of the various translations ascribed to Alfred were considered, and the Mercian dialectic peculiarities discovered by Miller in the '*Historia*', with their significance, were mentioned. The diverse methods employed in different portions of the '*Historia*' itself, such as different translations of *dignus*, *præesse*, *octo*, *novem*, were indicated.

Prof. Pearce's conclusion was that the work was probably done by several translators, to whom it was apportioned by Alfred. The writer was not prepared to define the work of each translator, but the *Præfatio* was done by one who had no part in the remainder of the work.

Points involved in the paper were discussed in an interesting way by Dr. Bright, Professor Greene, President March, and Prof. Elliott.

Professor C. H. Ross, of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama, read the

second paper—a careful and exhaustive treatise on the "Absolute Participle in Middle and Modern English." The work is a sequel to Prof. Morgan Callaway's well-known dissertation on the same construction for the Anglo-Saxon period. Prof. Ross found that the use of the absolute participle practically ceased in the first Middle English period. The influence of French and Italian in its revival was traced, and the gradual increase of the construction was statistically shown. The change of the substantive with the participle from the dative to the nominative case, with the reasons therefor, were considered, and it was concluded that the case used is really a "dative absolute in disguise." A discussion of the stylistic effect of the absolute construction closed the paper.—This contribution was discussed by Professors Garnett, Greene, March, Hatfield, Pearce, and Dr. Bright.

The second session was begun by Professor George Hempl, of the University of Michigan, reading a paper on the "Sources of Udall's *Roisterdoister*." Only portions of the paper were read, but the main point was, rather reversing the old opinion, that Udall's first and chief source was Terence's *Eunuch*, and that '*Miles Gloriosus*' of Plautus was a secondary source to fill the *lacunæ* left by the other.

Prof. Hempl could not give his arguments in full, and those who discussed the paper—Dr. Bright and Dr. Gudeman—were inclined to maintain the traditional claims of Plautus as the chief source.

Prof. John Phelps Fruit, of Bethel College, Ky., read the next paper on "The Gardener's Daughter; or, the Pictures." The paper was a practical exposition of Prof. Fruit's method of teaching literature; which is, in brief, to take first an outline view of a masterpiece, and to approach the details by gradual steps from this.

This paper, as Prof. Greene, in opening the discussion, said, invited rather reflection than discussion, and reminded one of the time when, at the meetings of the Association, pedagogical subjects were predominant.

"The Legend of the Holy Grail" was the subject treated by Prof. George M. Harper, of

Princeton College, N. J. The subject was considered in the light of the recent researches by Nutt and Rhys. This investigation has shown the Celtic origin of the story, the legend of Joseph of Arimathea, grafted on later, becoming, however, the soul of the legend. The Grail and the Christian elements grew in importance until Tennyson and Wagner idealized the chivalric elements.

Dr. F. M. Warren, of Adelbert College, Ohio, in opening the discussion, said that its subject was the most difficult question in literary history. German critics deny *in toto* the results of this paper. Dr. Matzke continued the discussion.

In the evening of the first day of the Convention, at 8 o'clock, Prof. Francis A. March, LL. D., President of the Association, gave a pleasing address on "Recollections of Language Teaching." It was the story of the changes in methods of teaching from Professor March's own school-days until the present time. The contrasts brought out were interesting.

The first session of the second day was begun with a paper by Prof. H. E. Greene, of Wells College, N. Y., on "A Grouping of Figures of Speech, based upon the Principle of their Effectiveness." The figures were considered in the order in which they tax the imagination; that is, in which they are removed from the literally true—true according to the understanding. Allegory draws most severely upon the imagination, and stands in this sense highest in the scale. Metaphor is practically most important.

Prof. Fruit opened the discussion. He considers the effectiveness of figures dependent upon the nature of the composition.

Dr. Bright found twenty figures in six lines of Prof. Greene's synopsis, though, according to rhetoric, there are none: these are unconscious figures. An interesting question bearing upon their effectiveness is: Which figures tend most to unconsciousness?

Dr. E. S. Lewis, of Princeton College, N. J., read the next paper on "Guernsey: Its People and Dialect." An interesting description was given of the physical features of the island, and of the life and manners of the people. Only a few dialectic peculiarities were noticed.

Prof. Elliott, in discussing the paper, said that Dr. Lewis had given only a few hints of his scientific-specialist's work on the dialect. This dialect is interesting, because we have several distinct speech currents mingling here.

"The Burlesque Ballad in Germany" was the subject of a paper by Dr. C. von Klenze, of Cornell University. The burlesque ballad, imported into Germany by Gleim, in 1750, is an exponent of the artificiality of the time and a parody of the *Volkslied*. The *Volkslied* is distinguished by sincerity, directness of style, completeness—an exponent of the nation; the burlesque ballad was an exponent of the individual, and it was characterized by silliness, low wit, lasciviousness. Bürger revived the spirit of the *Volkslied*, and issued a strong protest against the spirit of the burlesque ballad in "Lenore."

Prof. von Jagemann, in opening the discussion, wished that Dr. von Klenze might have continued the subject down to the present day: at fairs and festivals such ballads are still sung.

Dr. von Klenze thought the difference in these productions was that the eighteenth century writers considered their work lasting—true poetry.

Dr. Wood agreed with Prof. von Jagemann, and thought Dr. von Klenze ought to have distinguished more clearly between burlesque poetry and popular poetry, and ought to have defined burlesque: without this the subject has no definite limits.

The afternoon session was begun with a paper by Prof. T. Logie, of Williams College, on "Manuscript 24310, and other MSS. in the Paris National Library which contain French metrical versions of the Fables of Walter of England." The paper opened with a general account of the interest in fables from the time of Phædrus; then followed a consideration of the works of Robert, Oesterley, De Ménil, Mall, Hervieux, and Jacobs. A description of the MSS. containing French translations from the Latin of Walter of England was given, and the relation of the four MSS. discussed. The paper was concluded with a consideration of the value of MS. 24310, and some notes upon it.

The paper was discussed by Prof. Elliott, Prof. Gerber, and Dr. Matzke.

The last paper of the second day was on "Erasmus' Works, especially the Encomium Moriae and the Colloquies as Sources of Rabelais' political, religious, and literary Satire" by Dr. Herman Schönfeld, Johns Hopkins University. Dr. Schönfeld spoke first of the importance of this investigation, owing to the wide influence of Rabelais on the world's literature. The *a posteriori* evidence for the influence of Erasmus over Rabelais was—Rabelais' having studied Erasmus; a letter of Rabelais to Erasmus Nov. 30, 1532; similar results from their education; both made the same enemies; works of both secretly published with forged interpolations. *A priori* evidence is the analogous thought and form in the writings of both—both humanists; analogy of systems of education; satirical writings of both deal with—a. kings and nobles; b. popes and prelates; c. cloisters, and scholastic schools and teachers; d. church institutions; e. judges and physicians.

Dr. Schönfeld read only portions of his work, consequently in the discussion, lead by Prof. Fontaine, some exceptions were taken to his conclusions.

The first paper on the third day of the meeting was on "The Tales of Uncle Remus traced to the Old World" by Prof. A. Gerber, Earlham College, Ind. The two most prominent theories to account for the coincidences in the folk-tales of different countries are migration and accidental agreement. A considerable number of the tales of Uncle Remus bear so close a resemblance to the tales found in Africa or Europe that they must have been imported from those countries. This makes it probable that the majority of the other tales in which similarity is noticeable have the same origin. Accordingly, the theory of migration ought to be more generally accepted, at least as far as the animal tales are concerned.

Prof. F. M. Warren, in opening the discussion, referred to his work in tracing some of these tales to the 'Roman de Renart.' He found many so closely related that they must have been translated from the French. The discussion was continued by Profs. Garner and Hennemann.

Prof. J. B. Henneman, of Hampden-Sidney College, read the next paper on "The His-

torical Study of English in Virginia." The paper was a special consideration of the work of Thomas Jefferson in Virginia, and of Louis F. Klipstein in Virginia and South Carolina. The latter was a Virginian by birth, not a German, as Wülcker would make him. The paper, of which only part was read, closed with a general sketch of the historical study of English in Virginia colleges and universities.

Dr. Henneman's paper was discussed by Prof. Garnett, who traced still further the study of English at the University of Virginia.

The morning session was closed with a paper by Prof. Sylvester Primer, of the University of Texas, on "Lessing's Religious Development with special reference to his Nathan the Wise." Prof. Primer's paper was divided into two parts. In the first part he considered Lessing's theological writings and religious controversies; in the second, characters and drama, discussing the question whether Lessing has reached in his drama the high ideal established in his theological writing. Only part of this paper was read, so that any discussion of Prof. Primer's conclusions here would rather anticipate the complete publication of the paper in the *Proceedings* of the Association.

The first paper of the afternoon, and final session of the Convention, was read by Dr. Thomas P. Harrison, of the Johns Hopkins University, it being "A Study of the Middle English Poem, 'The Pystyl of Susan.'" The three MSS. in which the poem is found were described, and the dialect as bearing upon its origin was discussed. The question of authorship, and the claims of 'Huchown of the Awle Ryale'—possibly Sir Hugh of Eglinton—were considered. A discussion of the style of the poem—its verse-structure and general characteristics—closed the paper. The work is introductory to a collated text and a glossary, which as yet have never been prepared for the poem.

Dr. Henneman opened the discussion. He called attention to several important matters in former work on this poem, and agreed with Trautmann's results, but protested against his methods.

Mr. L. E. Menger, of the Johns Hopkins University, read a paper on "Irregular Forms of Possessive Pronouns in Italian." The special

object of the paper was to give an explanation of the irregular plural forms, *mīa, tua, sua*, which occur with such frequency in the autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini. The different explanations of these forms which have been held so far were discussed, and on the basis of an exhaustive study of Tuscan texts between the years 1230 and 1595, Mr. Menger came to the conclusion that the forms in question are remnants of Latin neuter plural forms.

The last paper was on "J. G. Schottel's Influence on the Development of the Modern German Schriftsprache" by Prof. von Jagemann, of Harvard University. Among the many interesting points which the paper brought out, the influence of Schottel upon the vocabulary of German was made very prominent.

On account of the lateness of the hour, discussion on the two preceding papers was limited, and the Association adjourned to meet again in Washington during the Christmas holidays of 1893.

The number of papers presented was unusually large, and they differed from those of previous years in being, in almost every case, statements of the results of original research. There were no pedagogical studies, with the exception of one or two papers that might be construed as such. This tendency is regarded as deplorable by some members of the Association. The discussions of the papers were interesting, and it was proposed to limit henceforth the number of papers, that more time may be devoted to discussion.

The social aspects of the meeting were as prominent and profitable as usual. In the intervals between sessions, at the University and in the lobby of the hotel (Ebbitt House), personal intercourse among the members contributed much to that bond that unites scholars of like aim and purpose. The Association was also handsomely entertained on Thursday evening at the residence of Prof. A. Melville Bell, President of the Phonetic Section.

The Association was reluctantly compelled to accept the resignation of its zealous and indefatigable Secretary, Prof. A. M. Elliott, the real founder of the organization. This regret was, however, mitigated by the judicious promotion of Dr. James W. Bright to the

secretaryship, and by the appointment of Dr. John E. Matzke treasurer.

The attendance at the meeting was large, and it was considered one of the most successful meetings the Association has held.

THOS. P. HARRISON.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

IMMEDIATE AND ULTIMATE  
SOURCE OF THE RUBRICS AND  
INTRODUCTIONS TO THE  
PSALMS IN THE PARIS  
PSALTER.

IN Thorpe's Preface to his edition of the Anglo-Saxon translation of the Psalms<sup>1</sup>—the so-called Paris Psalter—we find the following statement with reference to the Latin rubrics which regularly head the Psalms in this version, p. 6: "Ex rubricis Latinis plurimae adeo scitent barbarismis, ut vix intelligi possint."

It will probably be of interest to future editors of the Paris Psalter to know that the Latin rubrics referred to in the passage quoted, with the exception of a few cases of adaptation and still fewer of absolute divergence, which I shall note below, are taken verbatim from the *argumenta* of the voluminous commentary entitled "*In Psalmorum Librum Exegesis*" and formerly ascribed to the Venerable Bede. This commentary, which I shall cite simply as *Exegesis*, is included in all the earlier editions of Bede's collected works but is now most accessible in Migne's 'Patrologiae Latinae Cursus Completus,' vol. xciii, pp. 478-1098.

The arguments which accompany each psalm in the above-mentioned commentary consist regularly of two divisions, the first of which presents a historical interpretation of the particular psalm and the second, in closer conformity to the mediaeval spirit, a mystical interpretation, according to which the Psalm is conceived as the voice of Christ, or the Church, or the Apostles, or what not. Now, the Anglo-Saxon adapter does not anywhere attempt to reproduce these arguments in full. He simply contents himself with reproducing sentences,

<sup>1</sup> 'Libri Psalmorum, Versio Antiqua Latina; cum paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica partim soluta oratione partim metricè composita nunc primum descripsit et edidit Benjamin Thorpe, Oxonii, e typographeo Academico, mdcccxv.''



in rare instances, or as a rule, parts of sentences which are intended to indicate in this abbreviated form, though often very obscurely, as it happens, the historical or mystical interpretation to be applied to the psalm. Accordingly, on a comparison of the rubrics as they are found in Thorpe and the original, respectively, the apparent barbarisms wherever observed by the editor will be seen to be due to systematic abbreviations of the original undertaken by the Anglo-Saxon copyist or copyists and, in some instances besides, to corruptions of the text from the same source.

In order to illustrate the manner in which these abbreviations have been made, I will place side by side three examples, selected almost at random, of rubrics of psalms as they appear in Thorpe with those sentences of the arguments of the original of which they are abbreviated reproductions. I bring forward these examples simply for the purpose of rendering as clear as is possible by such means the relation which is general between the rubrics of the Paris Psalter and the arguments of *Exegesis*. I have complete material collected for the discussion of these relations in detail, and, I may add, for the discussion of the various points which will subsequently be brought up in this article and purposely refrain, for the present, from touching on the many important conclusions to which an examination of this material leads. I reserve this detailed discussion, then, for a dissertation I have in preparation on "The Anglo-Saxon Translation of the Psalms (both prose and metrical divisions) and its relation to the original," the publication of which has been delayed by temporary, but unavoidable causes.

First, I shall select Ps. 44.<sup>2</sup> The rubrics for this Psalm appear respectively, as follows:—

Propheta de Christo ad Ecclesiam dicit, de regina auri (sic).

Thorpe, p. 109.

Propheta de Christo ad Ecclesiam dicit, *legendus (sic) ad Evangelium Matthaei* de regina Austri.

*Exegesis*, p. 714.

<sup>2</sup> As two of the three works which enter especially into the following discussion show the vulgate numbering of the Psalms, I shall cite according to that numbering throughout the present article.

The passage concerning the Queen of the South to which reference is made will be found at St. Matthew, xii. 42.

Similarly, Ps. 67:—

Prophetae (sic) resurrectionem Christi.

Thorpe, p. 166.

Propheta resurrectionem Christi *et posteriores glorias annuntiat.*

*Exegesis*, p. 828.

Again, Ps. 90.

Ubi tentatur Christus, Vox Ecclesiae ad Dominum.

Thorpe, p. 252.

*Legendum ad Evangelium Marci* ubi tentatur Christus, Vox Ecclesiae ad Dominum.

*Exegesis*, p. 930.

The above examples sufficiently illustrate the numerous instances of abbreviation. The cases, however, in which the words of the original have been taken over into the rubrics of the Paris Psalter without abbreviation are equally numerous, whilst the cases in which these rubrics express independently the matter of their original in different words rise hardly above a dozen. On the other hand, the Latin rubrics of seven<sup>3</sup> psalms are wanting in the Ms. of the Paris Psalter, and of those which are extant eleven show actual divergence from the original, namely: Ps. 21, 24, 45, 102, 112, 113, 117, 129, 135, 139, 141. As I propose to discuss these divergences in the dissertation to which I have already referred, I shall not enter here into a more detailed consideration of the cause of the differences which the psalms just enumerated exhibit.

It will be observed that in the above paragraph I have drawn no distinction between the rubrics of the prose and metrical divisions of the Paris Psalter. As a matter of fact, in the one as well as in the other, the originals of these rubrics are found in the arguments of *Exegesis*—but in reference to the rubrics which fall in the metrical division it is curious

<sup>3</sup> Eight according to Thorpe who overlooked the rubric to Ps. 30. This has been recovered, however, by G. Tanger and will be found in his valuable collation of the Paris Psalter *Angliæ vi Anz.* pp. 125 ff. The words of this rubric "Confessio est credentium Deum" are taken without change from the corresponding argument in *Exegesis* p. 629.

and important to observe that, wherever it is possible, they are invariably drawn from those sections of the respective arguments of their originals which represent the mystic interpretation of the Psalms—a preference not observed in the prose division and which we shall leave unexplained for the present. Only in the case of Ps. 60, 62, 73, 92, the rubrics of the Paris Psalter repeat the characteristic historical interpretations of *Exegesis* for the reason that in these psalms the usual alternative mystical interpretations were wanting. The same was true of Ps. 74, 141 and 142, but the mystical interpretation, evidently so necessary for the satisfaction of the copyist's mind, were here supplied, notwithstanding—certainly, in the first two cases, at least,—from the *Explanations* which stand in *Exegesis* between the arguments and the commentary proper.

I shall next proceed to consider the curious Anglo-Saxon arguments or introductions which are found preceding each psalm of the prose division of the Paris Psalter except Ps. 1, 21, 26. It is evidently accidental that in these three cases the Anglo-Saxon arguments have not been preserved. Now, with regard to the origin of the arguments in question, according to the statement of Thorpe (Preface, p. 7) they are "partim ex scriptis Divi Hieronymi desumpta, partim, ut videtur, ipsius interpretis ingenio excogitata." Again in the article by J. Wichmann entitled "König Aelfreds Angelsächsische Übertragung der Psalmen i-li exclusiv.", *Anglia*, xi, 39-96, we find the following statement, p. 49:—

"Aus den Überschriften mehrerer psalmen deren inhalt sich auf bestimmte Davidische verhältnisse nicht beziehen lässt, geht hervor dass der übersetzer dieselben ihrem inhalt gemäss formte, alles jedoch in einer art die eine benutzung irgend eines Kommentars vollkommen ausschliesst."

Notwithstanding the assertions I have just quoted, in part very positive, it will be evident after even a slight examination of the subject, that the Anglo-Saxon arguments of the Paris Psalter are simply paraphrases of the same *argumenta* of the *In Psalmorum Librum Exegesis* from which, as we have seen above, its Latin rubrics were borrowed. Only, in the case of the Anglo-Saxon introductions, the *Explanations* of the original are frequently drawn on

and in several instances the commentary itself has supplied details. Use is also generally made of the Septuagint titles which precede both *Argumenta* and *Explanations* in *Exegesis*. We shall be able to judge by examples below exactly with what degree of freedom the author of the introductions has used his originals. It may only be remarked in general that the material is treated with greater liberty as he advances in his work. Paraphrases freer than the normal are practically found altogether after Ps. 25,

Characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon arguments or introductions is the interpretation they exhibit of each psalm under two, three, or even four different aspects, reflected in corresponding divisions—first with regard to its import when sung by David himself, or again, when sung by or prophesied concerning the apostle, or when sung by or prophesied concerning Christ or, it may be, some other sacred or historical personage, according to the particular psalm. The alternative conception of a psalm as the utterance not simply of the historical King but of the "true David" (cf. *Exegesis*, p. 562 A), namely, Christ, is current throughout our Latin commentary and is in thorough conformity with the mediaeval spirit, so that we need not feel surprise at finding the psalms in the Anglo-Saxon arguments conceived as spoken not only *in voce prophetarum* but *in voce Christi*. It remains to point out, however, that the divisions according to which the psalms are also conceived as sung by, or prophesied concerning righteous men, in general, or personages, usually sacred, of Jewish history, etc., owe their suggestion primarily to the division of the original arguments into two parts, one representing the historical, the other the mystical interpretation. The Psalms are often interpreted in these arguments as the voice of the Church which is Christ's body made up of all the righteous. But the force of the suggestion was strengthened, no doubt, and its form determined by certain other and more definite expressions of *Exegesis*, according to which the psalms are conceived as prophecies spoken concerning or by the righteous. For example, cf. Praefatio altera (p. 480. C.) "Haec autem prophetia (that is, the Psalms) loquens de corpore, ali-

quando introducitur aliquem perfectum orantem, ut in *Te decet etc.*, introduxit Moyses. Aliquando introducitur aliquem inferiorem ut aliquam animam poenitentem, aliquando introducitur ipsum caput." Again, p. 501. C. choice is given of taking a psalm as "vox totius Ecclesiae aut unius tantum membri, id est, fidelis alicujus animae."

But I will not multiply examples as I could easily do. It is better to proceed at once to illustrate the relations of the contents of the Anglo-Saxon arguments to the contents of their Latin originals and the method of paraphrasing. I shall do this, as in the similar case above, by means of select examples, reserving an exhaustive discussion of my collected material for the detailed treatment which I have in preparation. I shall select for this purpose Ps. 33 and 45. It is to be observed that in the following introductions, in accordance with the general habit of their author, details found in that division of the Latin argument which lays down the historical interpretation, and given there with reference to some other personage or personages of Jewish history, are in the Anglo-Saxon paraphrases somewhat grotesquely made to do service for King David as well. At the end follow the usual mechanical application of the psalm to Christ, also. In neither of these psalms is use made of the Septuagint title except as regards its ascription of the psalm to David.

The historical interpretation of Ps. 33 in *Exegesis* runs as follows:—

"Ezechias, victo Assyrio, semper Dominum benedicere promittit, et angelum adiutorem sibi precatur immitti, moxque ad exemplum sui canctos in Dei laudem provocat."

*Exegesis*, p. 651.

Compare the corresponding Anglo-Saxon introduction:—

*Dávid sang ðysne ðreo and ðrittigoðan sealme, gehátende Drihtne ðaet hē hine symle wolde bletsian, for ðæm gifum ðe hē him geaf; and hē wilnode on ðæm sealme, ðaet him god sende his godcundne engel on his fulum; and hē lærde eac, on ðæm sealme, aelcne man ðe aefter him wære ðaet hē ðaet ylce dyde; and hē witgode eac, on ðæm sealme, be Ezēchie ðam kincge, ðaet hē scolde ðaet ylce dōn aefter ðam sige, ðe hē haefde wið Assirium; and ðaet ylce hē witgode be Criste ðaet hē ðaet ylce dōn wolde, and eac ððre læran.*

Thorpe, p. 74.

Similarly for Ps. 45. The less familiar proper names, it will be observed, appear in the Anglo-Saxon introduction in corrupt forms:—

"Ex persona canitur duarum tribuum, pro liberatione sua gratias agentium, quando Phaceas filius Romelie et Rasin rex Syriæ Achas regem et Jerosolyma volentes expugnare, non valuerunt, sed ipsi potius sunt ab Assyriorum rege conquassati."

*Exegesis*, p. 724.

*Dávid sang ðysne fif and feowertigoðan sealme ðanciende gode ðaet hē hine oft alysde of manegum earfoðum; and eac hē witgode ðaet ðaet ylce sceoldon dōn ða men, ða ðe twa scitra (ðaet ys Jude and Benjamin) ðaet hy sceoldon ðam gode ðancian, ðe hygefriðode from ðære ymbsetenness, and from ðære herunge ðara twēga kynincga, Sacces, Rūmeles suna, and Rasses, Sýria cynincges: naes ðæt nā gedōn for ðaes cynincges geearnnuga Achats, ac for godes mildheortnesse and for his yldrena gewyrhtum hit gewearð, ðaet ða twēgen cyningas wæron adrifene from Assýria cyng; and eac ðaet ylce hē witgode be aelcum rihtwisum menn ðe ærest geswenced byð and eft geārod; and eac be Criste and be Jūdēum, hē witgode ðaet ylce.*

Thorpe, p. 113.

A full comparison of the Anglo-Saxon arguments with the originals on which they are based reveals the fact that the interpretations peculiar to the latter are reproduced in every instance except in Ps. 3, 7, 23 and 34. These psalms, however, constitute no real exceptions. In each of them the use of details of the Latin originals proves their dependence on the latter. Only in the case of Ps. 3 and 7, the author has drawn on the Septuagint titles alone for historical interpretations, and in the case of Ps. 23 and 34, the usual reference of the psalm to a definite historical period is omitted altogether.

Having thus indicated the originals of the Latin rubrics and Anglo-Saxon introductions of the Paris Psalter, I will now pass to the question concerning the ultimate source of the peculiar interpretations incorporated in the arguments of *Exegesis* which distinguish it among all Latin commentaries of the Middle Ages. It will, perhaps, be of interest to students of the Psalms in general to learn that,

with certain definite exceptions which I shall point out below, these interpretations coincide throughout with those of the Syriac commentary on the Psalms existing in MS., Sachau No. 215 of the Royal Library at Berlin. In the *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, v, 53 ff. 1885, Prof. Frederick Baethgen has proved the Syriac commentary to represent simply an epitome of the commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the friend of John Chrysostom and the chief of the Antiochean School of Exegesis—whose work had been hitherto known only in rather scanty fragments of the original Greek (see Migne, Tom. 66, Series Graeca). Although the work, as a whole, as far as I can learn, still remains in MS., Prof. Baethgen has published in the article cited—the first of a series relating to Therodore's commentary,—partly in the original, but for the most part, in translation only, the superscriptions which stand before each psalm in the Syriac MS., laying down the especial interpretation to be applied to that psalm. By a further comparison of these superscriptions with those contained in the Scholia of Bar-Hebraeus, Prof. Baethgen has been able to prove that the latter represent the same tradition of Theodorean interpretation. In the two works the superscriptions are, in fact, essentially the same. With reference to the date of the Syriac Epitome, Prof. Baethgen (see p. 101) has been unable to trace the tradition it represents beyond the age of Bar-Hebraeus, namely, the thirteenth century. I would call attention to the fact that the source of Theodorean interpretation which I now indicate in *Exegesis* has, at least, the interest of being some centuries earlier than this, since even the MS. of the Anglo-Saxon Psalter dates from the eleventh century, and the origin of *Exegesis* should, probably, be referred to a considerably earlier period of the Middle Ages.

But let us examine more closely the relation of the interpretations of the Syriac MS., which, following Prof. Baethgen, I shall designate *N*, to those of *Exegesis*. Excluding for the moment the first fifteen psalms, it will be found on comparison that these interpretations differ only in the following cases, namely; Ps. 37, 47, 139–143 inclusive, and probably Ps. 150.

For the first fifteen psalms (vulgate numbering), *N* and *Exegesis* coincide only in the case of Ps. 1, 10, 13, and possibly, Ps. 9 where *Exegesis*, however, offers a choice of interpretation not found in *N*. It is important, however, to observe in all cases where the arguments of *Exegesis* show an interpretation differing from that of the Syriac superscriptions that they still exhibit the characteristics of Theodorean interpretation, especially its historical spirit. Considering the total number of cases of undoubted divergence, namely, eighteen, we find that in all but five Psalms—2, 8, 11, 14, 47—the peculiarity of *Exegesis* consists in its reference of these Psalms to the reign of King Hezekiah, which are not so referred by *N*.

It is more profitable, however, with my present limited space, to consider the relation of the arguments and superscriptions respectively, in those cases where the interpretation according to *Exegesis* and *N* is identical. Even if we exclude Ps. 9 and 150 from consideration, as we must Ps. 87 where only the mystic interpretation has been preserved in *Exegesis*, one hundred and twenty-nine Psalms out of the total one hundred and fifty exhibit identity of interpretation. In many cases so close are they, even in the matter of expression, that the Latin might not unfairly be taken as a direct translation of the Syriac. I would call attention to the distinction maintained by both *N* and *Exegesis* between Psalms spoken by the "people" captive in Babylon, and by those who are designated "excellent" or "noble" among the people. Thus, Professor Baethgen's translations, "Das Volk" and "Die Edlen des Volks", find their equivalents in *Exegesis* in "populus" and such phrases as *qui inter eos merito celsiores* (Ps. 65), *qui ibi meritis eminebant* (Ps. 129). In a majority of cases, however, the arguments of *Exegesis* appear fuller in form than the corresponding superscriptions in *N*. It is not to be inferred at once, however, that the greater fullness of *Exegesis* in such cases is due to expansions undertaken by the Latin translator. For instance, certain details included in the arguments of *Exegesis* to Psalms 108, 117, 124, 131, 132, which do not appear in the superscriptions of *N*, are found, nevertheless,



in Bar-Hebraeus. Again, in several instances where the Greek of Theodore has been preserved, *Exegesis* is found to reflect the details of the original more fully than *N*.

As an example of such instances, I will place side by side below Theodore's interpretation of Ps. 49 according to the original Greek *Exegesis* and according to the superscription of *N*, as it appears in Prof. Baethgen's translation, respectively. They run as follows:

καὶ οὗτος ἥλικός ὁ ψαλμός, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐτι  
πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, πρὸς Ἰουδαίους  
δὲ μόνον ὥσπερ ἀμελούντας μὲν ἀρετῆς,  
τὸ δὲ πᾶν τιθέμενους ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις τοῦ  
νόμου ἕως τοῦ εἰδέναι τὰ ρήματα μόνον  
ἐπιμελουμένους, οὐκ ἐτι δὲ καὶ τὰ προδιδάγ-  
ματα θνλάττειν. καὶ φοβερότερον αὐτοῖς  
καταδμενᾶζων τὸν λόγον σχηματοποιεῖ κρι-  
τὴν δικάγοντα καὶ τοὺς ἐλεγχουμένους.

(*Z. a. W.*, v, 85 f.).

In priore psalmo ad omnes homines sermonem direxit, nunc ad Judaeos loquitur, consternare volens et emendare peccantes qui, virtutum negligentes, solas curarent hostias. Quod totum exsequitur terribiliore suggestu, quasi tribunal judiciale describens ut sit tota compellatio Dei plena terroris.

*Exegesis*, p. 739.

Tadelt die Juden weil sie meinten dass in Opfern allein die Gottesföhrung zur Ausführung komme und im Lesen des Gesetzes und nicht durch die Eigenschaften des Charakters und gutes Verhalten indem sie sonst die Tugend verachteten.

(*Z. a. W.*, v, 85).

Similarly, not to cite other instances, for Ps. 55, cf. the original Greek and *N* (*Z. a. W.*, vii, 3), with the argument in *Exegesis*, p. 774, for Ps. 78, cf. *Z. a. W.*, vii, 48 f., and *Exegesis*, p. 910.

It will be observed, of course, that the differences which *N* and *Exegesis* show in the cases cited are not essential differences. It is none the less important, however, that they should be noted, for, in so far as fuller details occur in *Exegesis*, they tend to prove that its author drew directly from the original Greek and it will be necessary to keep this in mind when we come to examine the question of the authority of the arguments of *Exegesis* where they show an essentially different interpre-

tation from the superscriptions of the Syriac Epitome.

I have, however, already transgressed the limits which I had prescribed for this article. For the present, I shall content myself with having indicated a hitherto unrecognized source of evidence regarding the details of Theodore's interpretation of the Psalms. As I have before stated, I shall return to this subject in a fuller discussion, and I shall in that place endeavor to determine the exact value of our new source for the interpretation of the individual Psalms, by drawing into comparison the full evidence of the Syriac commentary and such portions of the original Greek as are preserved.

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

#### OBSERVATIONS ON THE SPANISH LANGUAGE IN GUATEMALA.

In his book on Guatemala (pp. 304, 305) Professor Otto Stoll of Zurich has written a short excursus on the origin of some specifically Guatemalan expressions. A few observations on the language of Guatemala, so far as it is the language of the Spanish-speaking common people, may not here be out of place.

From personal observation I am acquainted with many *Chapinismos* ("provincialismos guatemaltecos"), and through the kindness of Professor Stoll, I have been able to compare the notes collected by him with my own. Our impressions received a general confirmation through Don Matias Lopez, a native of Guatemala, temporarily resident in Berlin.

With reference to the pronunciation there is to be remarked:

1. Tendency to the nasalisation of the final *-n*, similar to the termination *-ng*; for example, *tambieng* (pronounce *tambieng-ge*, the last syllable being quite faintly sounded) instead of *tambien*; *tenieng* (pronounce *tenieng-ge*) instead of *tenian*, etc.

Stoll conjectures that this nasalisation is of Galician origin, as many Galicians (Gallegos) went over with the conquerors and colonists in the position of servants. It has resemblance neither to the Portuguese nor to the French.

The state of the case seems to me to be this: The final (*auslautende*) Spanish *-n* has either

in general or under certain conditions, a pronunciation corresponding to *-ng*, or very similar to it, at least in Middle and South Spain. Vide Storm, *Engl. Phil.*, i. 38.; Schuchardt, *Ztschr. f. rom. Phil.*, v, 315; Wulff, "Chapitre de phon. andal."; wrongly Paul Förster, 'Span. Sprachlehre,' p. 8, note 1, for there is no question here of "a French nasalisation": hence too, the sign *ŋ* proposed by Gröber is not appropriate. Since then in Guatemala *tambieng*, *tenieng* is spoken, the colony does not differ from the mother-country, at least not from Andalusia, whose pronunciation has in general established itself throughout America.

The after-sounding *-ge* is very striking, almost incomprehensible. I do not at all understand how Indians or Negroes could have come upon it; for in all languages, even in those that have a liking for the vocalic final sound, the tendency toward a guttural nasal is quite general.

The Guatemalan [tambie]ng-ge, which I have heard from the mouth of Matias Lopez, has approximately the same pronunciation as in finger—finger-ge[r].

2. *c* before *e*, *i*; and *z* before *a*, *o*, *u* have the sound of *s*; for example, *sinco* instead of *cinco*, *sumbar* instead of *zumbar*, etc., as in Andalusian.

3. *ll* has the sound of *y*; for example, *cava-yo* instead of *caballo*, *yegar* instead of *llegar*. As in Andalusian, and in other dialects.

4. Since the sound *f* is wanting in the Indian vernacular, many Indians who speak Spanish only imperfectly, are unable to pronounce it, and say *San Pelip* instead of *San Felipe*, *palta* instead of *falta*, *pamilia* instead of *familia*, *pospor* instead of *fosforos*, etc. As Schuchardt has shown, we find the same peculiarity (*p* for *f*) in the Tagalo-Spanish of the Philippine islands.

Those Indians, on the other hand, who in addition to their mother-tongue have learned Spanish from childhood, pronounce *f* without difficulty. Many confound initial *f* with *j*, which is more natural to them, and say "tengo juego en la boca" instead of *fuego*, and the like.

Gröber used to call such exchange (as *f* for *p* or *j*) idiomatic sound-substitution (*Lautsubstitution*); in his 'Grundriss der Roman. Phil.,'

i, 243, however, he calls it sound-adaption (*Lautanpassung*). This kind of sound-change he assumes *inter alia* in the case of the Spanish *h* from the Latin *f*. The Iberians had no *f*.

5. In some Indian loan-words we find *š*; for example, *Mišco* (*Mišco*, place name), *tapišcar* (*tapišcar*, to harvest maize); *cacašre* (*cacašre*, Indian hand-barrow), etc. *š* was not foreign to the Spanish of Europe; in the beginning of the seventeenth century, *x*, *j* had still the sound *š*. If we say *Don Quišote*, we speak it as Cervantes spoke it. The *x* in Indian words and names springs from that early time. Elsewhere we have something similar. A borrowing from the Catalanian is not here to be thought of.

6. A further peculiarity consists in this, that in the Imperative 2d pers. sing. the final vowel is accentuated; for example, *corré* (run), and *đ* (go), *vení* (come), *decí* (say). These forms prove, that although they are now used in the singular, they originally represent the plural forms *corred*, *andad*, *venid*, *decid*, etc.

#### *Deviations from Spanish Form of Words.*

The vulgar tongue of Guatemala is distinguished by a certain antiqueness, in that it has preserved and still uses some forms of words, which in European Spanish have long since undergone change. To this class belongs, for example:

1. the Imperatives cited above under 6;
2. *mesmo* instead of *mismo*;
3. *truje* instead of *traje* (Germ. *trug*, *brachte*);
4. *ansí* instead of *así*;
5. *vos*, now used in the sense 'you' (sing.).—Germ. *du*—exclusively, it would seem, in intercourse with Indians; for example, *já ver, vos, vení acá!* 'Hey there, you, come here,' one would call out to an Indian, of whom one wished some information. *¿no sabés vos, donde vive tal y fulano?*

Non-Spanish foreigners seldom use this form correctly, as they construe it with the singular of the verb, and hence in the above mentioned instance say, *sabés* (*sabeis*) instead of *sábés*.

From these examples it becomes clear that they are mere remnants of the language, as it was spoken by Bernal Diaz del Castillo and the other *Conquistadores*. In consequence of local and social isolation they have been pre-

served among the common people, while among the educated classes, who have lived in continual literary intercourse with Spain, and have sought to imitate the there-prevailing speech, they have been lost.

By further adding that the common people, especially the Indians, frequently use some expressions mistakenly, I believe that I have mentioned everything of moment with regard to the language of Guatemala. Thus one hears frequently *primero Dios* (if God will) in the sense of 'Thank God' ('*gracias á Dios.*')

With regard to the word *china*, I may say that in Guatemala and Nicaragua it has quite a different meaning from that known elsewhere; for example in Peru, where it means a half-caste of Indian and European parents. In Guatemala, *china* is the nursemaid, and the verb *chinear* means 'to look after children.'

After consulting, on the ground of the information given by Stoll, R. J. Cuervo, '*Apuntaciones Criticas*'; B. Rivodo, '*Voces Nuevas*'; G. Maspero, '*Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, Vol. ii; and R. Lenz, '*Zeitschrift f. rom. Phil.*, xv, 518; after hearing, furthermore, Hugo Schuchardt's opinion, and having myself associated with Peruvians and Chilians, I can state scarcely anything characteristic of Guatemala.

The enigmatic after-sound of the *e* (*v*) in *tambieng-ge*, etc., is the only thing specially Guatemalan. Everything else, so far as I see, is Hispano-American, that is to say, Andalusian, in fact Castilian.

KARL LENTZNER.

Aberdeen, Scotland.

#### PAUL HEYSE'S 'MERLIN.'

HEYSE's purpose in writing his latest novel was to combat naturalism under the banner of idealism. His hero and mouth-piece, Georg Falkner, after obtaining a diploma in jurisprudence, decides to devote himself exclusively to the writing of dramas and, for a time, with his accomplished and responsive wife and a few congenial friends, he passes a quiet and happy life in the vicinity of a German town.

But his happiness is not to last. In Berlin, where he goes to see one of his dramas exhibited on the stage, he succumbs, in an hour of weakness, to the seductive charms of an

actress, thus losing his self-respect, and as he returns home, determined to confess all to his wife, he no longer finds her among the living. As a consequence of racking remorse and the strain of nervous excitement and overwork, inflammation of the brain is induced and he is placed in a sanitarium. There, in a dream in which he struggles with the woman that caused his fall, he cuts his own throat while thinking that he is cutting hers.

Naturalism such as preached and practiced by modern French, Russian and Norwegian writers, is in the eyes of Falkner-Heyse an epidemic, a moral influenza. "Nothing is true, it affirms, but the brutal, the vulgar and the vile." Naturalists, Falkner says, boast of truth and turn their backs upon beauty, and where do they pretend to find truth? In ordinary, common place and trivial reality. What is required to be a naturalist? No talent, no strength of mind, no depth of sentiment, but merely a certain technical training and delight in the vulgar. Naturalists boast of thorough "analysis" and of a "scientific method," but in their endeavor to reach truth they use the absurdest means, and forget the wise word that the secret of being tedious consists in telling all.

Georg Falkner, who foresees on his tombstone the epitaph "The last of idealists," is determined to swim against the current of naturalism, even at the risk of going down. "What is happiness?" he exclaims with the fervor of genuine idealism, "can you imagine no other happiness for the artist than that of being crowned with success? Is it not tragic bliss, too, to perish for having refused to sacrifice to the idols of one's time?" Thus he writes several tragedies, all historic, but they are refused by the leading theatres. Without losing courage, he with the blood of his heart, composes 'Merlin,' treating this time a legendary subject, Merlin being the well-known sorcerer of the cycle of king Artus. Since 'Merlin' is avowedly his best play and one with which he himself is highly pleased, we are evidently to look upon it as a model of idealistic composition, and as it is, at the same time, the focus of the whole novel, we are greatly interested in the analysis which its author gives of it. According to that, Merlin,

who controls all the most secret forces of nature, is touched and subdued by the pure nobleness of a woman, Blanche-flur, the king's daughter. The king, who is under obligation to the sorcerer—for he has procured for him the victory over his warlike neighbors by summoning the spirits to his assistance—consents to their marriage and they live together most happily for a number of years, for Merlin knows how to amuse his wife by all sorts of magic tricks. But there lives in the woods a most charming woman, Viviane, who is soon too much for Merlin's virtue. He at last completely surrenders himself to her charms, and in a still weaker moment even reveals to her the magic word by means of which he controls the forces of nature. Viviane soon turns her new art against her master, and binds him fast on a rock near a blooming hawthorn hedge, where the wretch lies pitifully helpless with no other company than that of his awakened conscience. His faithful wife tries to rescue him, but in vain, even pure womanhood being no match for sin; yet she returns once more to the hawthorn hedge, this time with her little son, who proves a more powerful charm than that of Viviane, for as soon as the child passes his hands over the eyes of his father, saying: "Dear father, it is I," the spell is broken, Merlin opens his eyes, recovers his strength and sinks into the arms of his wife.

What now is the fate of this play, for which its author takes to himself no inconsiderable credit? It is accepted by one of the inferior theatres of Berlin and the first representation proves successful, yet the success is merely due to the excellent acting of Viviane, for as soon as this part passes into the hands of another, the play proves a failure and has to be withdrawn from the stage.

The question now arises: What does Heyse prove? What he wants to prove is the superiority of idealism over naturalism, and who would not agree with his views on this point? But he also wants to prove and censure the perverse taste of our generation with its indifference to idealism, and how does he prove it? By the failure of 'Merlin.' Yet this proof lacks all force, inasmuch as 'Merlin' (this would-be representative of idealism) with its spirits and fabulous incidents, its magic and

sorcery, its wild fancy and weirdness is a product of romanticism. If romanticism is dead and buried, it is chiefly owing to the fantastic element which ran riot in it, and has no longer any hold upon us. The failure of 'Merlin' on the stage is, therefore, very natural and does not prove in itself any lack of appreciation of true idealism on the part of the public.

While admitting that naturalism has had the ear of the public for the last two decades, we are optimistic enough to believe that the same public is not wholly indifferent to idealism, but that the right kind of idealism has not been offered to it. Let the poet come that knows how to weave out of the wealth of reality a garment closely fitting his ideal, how to select among finite things those iridescent with the light of the infinite, how to create typical and, at the same time, individual characters, and he will drive out naturalism as the rising sun dispels the mist, provided he fulfil another indispensable condition; namely, that he will let the dead bones of by-gone ages alone and choose subjects within the horizon of our own thought and sentiment.

'Merlin' does not fulfil this condition. Its author is completely in the fetters of the antique and the romantic, just as Merlin in those of Viviane, and therefore powerless. He has a horror of all that is strikingly modern. Witness his conversation with Branitz. When Branitz declares that he wants to be excited in the theatre, Falkner asks: "But you surely discriminate in regard to excitement? I hope that you are much more affected when the Furies make Orestes mad than when, as I lately read in a Norwegian play, a weak-minded family man is forced by his nurse *coram publico* into a strait-jacket." To which Branitz replies that the strait-jacket is new and the Furies are old. It goes without saying that Branitz, in consequence, is beneath Falkner's contempt, and yet his answer implies a most vital principle.

Georg Falkner, we hope, was the last of romantic idealists. When will the first modern idealist come?

H. C. O. HUSS.

Princeton College.



## THE ETYMOLOGY OF GOSPEL.

THE derivation of this word forms the subject of two notes in this periodical. In the April number of 1889 (at col. 208), Dr. Bright tries to show that "the first element of the compound is *God*, not *good*." A supplementary communication—not of any essential import—will be found in the February number of 1890. Furthermore, we shall have to take cognizance of the views expressed by Prof. Skeat in his 'Etymological Dict.' (Skeat<sup>1</sup>), in his supplement to the same (Skeat<sup>2</sup>) and in his 'Principles of English Etymology,' first series (Skeat<sup>3</sup>). As it will be necessary for the right application of my contention that the reader should have, at least, the greater part of the evidence before his eyes, I may be pardoned for reproducing testimonies and argument, all of which have been printed before, partly even in this same periodical.

The oldest instances—such as those found in Old English Poetry, see Grein *in voce*—may here be safely ignored. The form *godspell*, without any sign of length or vowel shortness and which seems the only one found there, does not, of course, decide in favor of either view. The eleventh and twelfth centuries yield, what is considered better testimony.

We have, first of all, the eleventh century gloss: "*Euuangelium, id est, bonum nuntium, godspel*" (not *-ll* as Bright has it), Wright-Wülker, 314, 8,—see also Zupitza, 'Aelfric's Grammatik und Glossar,' p. 304. Skeat<sup>2</sup> considers this "a reasonable alteration," perhaps looking upon it as at first blush indicative of the derivation from *gód*. However this be, he still sticks to the view that the *o* was originally short. Dr. Bright objects to Skeat's qualifying as an alteration, what is merely "the subjective interpretation of an allegorizing monk." This means, if anything, that no importance attaches to this gloss. Then, how can Bright call this an "important factor"?

The fact is that, as I may here remark at once, the value of this gloss is just *nil*. More has been read into it than in may safely be taken to prove. *Bonum nuntium* which has been taken to indicate the glossator's derivation of *godspel* is merely to be looked upon as a translation of *euuangelium*.

It is strange that Dr. Bright who disputes

the evidence of this eleventh century testimony, should adduce another.<sup>1</sup> I shall not transcribe this passage which must be looked up, *ante*, 1890, col. 91. It seems to me that this passage again proves nothing. It is true that the spelling *gódspell*<sup>2</sup> seems to point to the homilist's deriving it from *gód*, but we also find here the words: *Godspell is witodlice godes sylfes lár. 7 þa word þe he spræc*, etc., which, surely, may be adduced with equal force to 'prove' that the writer looked upon the *ð* as short.

The third testimony is found in the 'Ormulum,' Ded. l. 157 ff., we find: *Goddspell onn Enugliss nennnedd iss God word 7 god tip-ennde, Goderrnde*, etc. (see the whole of the passage in White, Holt's ed. i.) So, as Dr. Bright remarks, there is a discrepancy between Orm's pronunciation and his derivation or explanation. Orm thought *god* originally *gód*, but evidently pronounced *gódspell*. Dr. Bright looks upon this as favoring his *gód* derivation. For, as the *ð* in Orm's time is evidently short, and as in order to account for its having become short, "the process of reducing (its) quantity (must be) placed earlier than can be admitted by the laws of Anglo-Saxon grammar," his natural inference is that the *o* was short. Relying on one or more of these testimonies, and on other arguments too—such as the parallel forms *gotspel* in O.H.G. and *guð-sþjall* in Icelandic (not *\*guot-* and *\*gód-*). Profs. Skeat and Bright, Grein and others have decided the one in favor of *gód*, the other in that of *gód* as being originally the first element of the compound under consideration. Thus for Skeat<sup>1</sup> the *o* was originally short. Skeat<sup>2</sup> evidently wavers, and as to Skeat<sup>3</sup> the eleventh century gloss has been too much for him. "At first this word was *gódspell*." Greine's view (*ð*) is influenced by, nay, ap-

<sup>1</sup>He does so "for such as are disposed to judge of the matter rather on such evidence than from the earlier history of the word." No evidence of what its earlier history was, is forthcoming.—I must add here that I believe Dr. Bright to be in error when he thinks that the extract quoted (was at that time) unprinted. See the London *Academy*, Oct. 5, 1889, p. 221.

<sup>2</sup>As Dr. Bright has "disregarded the . . . word-division of the manuscript," I must add that here the MS. really has *gódspell* in one word, and not *gód spell*. Mr. Frank Bickley of the British Museum was good enough to look this up for me.

parently due to the O.H.G. and Icelandic forms. Bright, as we have seen, thinks the *ð* short.

It will be noticed that all investigators merely argue from the point of view of the form-history of the word.

Now, let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that *gōdspell* was the original form. It can hardly be denied that in all probability—in fact, I am convinced that we may say with certainty—popular etymology would have taken hold of the word, and made it into *gōðspell*, that is, some people would have come to look upon it as the word of God (that is, Christ or the father). On the other hand, this change in meaning and in pronunciation need not have operated at once in everybody's mind. Some people for a longer or shorter time would continue to speak of *gōdspell*. If, on the other hand, with the same reservation, we assume that *gōðspell* were the original form, what do we see? With as much certainty we may expect popular etymology to have seized upon it and to have made it into *gōðspell*. Again: some people would continue to make the *ð* short.

Circumstances have given this word a singular adaptability to "popular etymology," which has unfortunately quite obscured its original "form-history." I quote this word on purpose from a preceding sentence so as to show that, and why, I think those investigators on the wrong scent, who have tried to argue from this point of view. It is true that mostly it leads to success, but I hope to make it clear that for once we must leave this safe path and enter upon one of conjecture. It must be perfectly clear that all support of either view propounded, and all opposition to them when founded on "grammar," that is, on organic changes, can be of no value, since all traces of the latter have entirely disappeared.

No doubt, this position is a very easy one to take up. We simply have the air of bidding good-bye to all guiding rules, and thus to boldly admit conjecture as a determining factor of word-investigators seems, at first sight, to be defying all accepted canons of criticism. I would, therefore, have it distinctly understood that such a proceeding is not to

be taken recourse to, in my opinion, save under very exceptional circumstances. These seem to me to be present in our case. Nor is the conjecture such a very hazardous one. We shall have to dismiss any considerations of form, but we shall not be left entirely without guidance.

I must here state that, in my opinion, the *o* of *godspell* was undoubtedly originally long. In order to arrive at this conclusion we have simply to ask ourselves this question: By whom and when was the need first felt of using the word, and under what circumstances? Undoubtedly by clerics, by learned men, therefore, at a time when Christianity began to spread to Teutonic countries. But the main interest of our question centres in the answer to its last part, namely, in which aspect must we suppose the first employers of the word to have viewed the matter, and whence did they draw the gospels, that is whence did they get the *word*? As they must have become acquainted with the scriptures either in Latin or Greek, the ultimate source is decidedly Greek *εὐαγγέλιον*, that is, *bonum nuntium*, that is, *gōd spell*.

Moreover did they view the gospel more especially as the life of Jesus Christ, the message which he was therein represented as having given to the world, in other words, was the fact of its being the story of his life and doctrines—"Godes sylfes lār 7 þa word þe he spræc"—the foremost circumstance which must have struck those who first needed the word in their *vernacular*? If so, there would be some reason to suppose that *gōðspell* also suggested itself to them. Or was it not so much the Saviour's life as such, as rather the joyous character of his message of peace and love by which this 'spell' would strike the early devotees of Christianity?

The answer, it would seem to me, must here clearly be affirmative. I hence look upon *gōdspell* as a translation of *euangelium*.

Even if this could not be granted, I venture to think that *à-priori* reasons speak in favor of the word being formed independently with a view to expressing the glad, joyous message. I hence look upon the original length of the *ō* as being established.

The O. H. G. and Scandinavian forms, as

well as Orm's *dd* point to the second stage of form-development. This stage can have been reached solely through popular etymology, and objections to this hypothesis founded on arguments concerning organic changes, such as that of Dr. Bright need carry no weight.<sup>3</sup>

H. LOGEMAN.

University of Ghent, Belgium.

A HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED TEXT  
OF THE "ÉVANGILE AUX  
FEMMES."

SINCE writing the paper on the "Évangile aux Femmes," of which an abstract was printed in MOD. LANG. NOTES for Jan., 1893, cols. 35-37, I have been so fortunate as to obtain a very satisfactory copy (made by E. Klis, Paris) of a version of the poem which has never before been published; namely, that of the Épinal MS., no. 189, f<sup>o</sup>. 37 r<sup>o</sup>.—f<sup>o</sup>. 37 v<sup>o</sup>. (formerly known as no. 59).

This MS. was mentioned by Franz Joseph Mone in his *Anzeiger für Kunde der deutschen Vorzeit*, v (1836), col. 58; a short description of it is given in 'Catalogue Général des Mss. des Bibl. Publiques des Départements,' iii (1861), p. 422, where it is known as no. 59; finally, François Bonnardot gave an extremely detailed account of the MS. in *Bulletin de la Soc. des Anc. Textes Français*, 1876, pp. 64-134, where he prints six verses of our poem.

L. Constans gives a few variant readings

from this MS. in *Ztsch. f. Roman. Phil.*, viii, pp. 24-36: and these, together with the six verses given by Bonnardot, constitute what has hitherto been published of this text. Bonnardot has established the date of 1462 as approximately that of the portion of the MS. containing our poem; the MS. was written in Metz by various members of the Desch family, and is mostly a collection of poems which seem to have struck the writer's fancy and were, therefore, transcribed as he met with them in his reading from time to time.

The quatrains of our poem transcribed by him appear to have been selected from some longer version in accordance with his usual practice. There is, moreover, a gap at the end of the preceding piece, which seems to include the first portion of our poem, which now begins at the top of the recto of a folio, and is without a title of any sort; probably a whole folio has been lost here, and with it, I imagine, about three or four quatrains of our poem (this last surmise was arrived at by comparison with the other versions of the poem).

The text itself is interesting as a specimen of the Lorraine dialect in the fifteenth century, seemingly much influenced by the forms of colloquial language. In the text as given below, I have enclosed in parentheses all resolutions of the abbreviated forms found in the MS.

Constans, 'Chrest. de l'Anc. Français,' 2d ed., pp. 199-201, may be compared.

BIBL. D'ÉPINAL, MS. No. 189.

f<sup>o</sup>. 37 r<sup>o</sup>.

Moult puet est(re) hom(m)e ioeuz (et) fai(r)e chi(er)e lie  
q(ua)nt fe(m)e lait a cure (et) ver lui sumelie  
hu(m)ble (com) berbix et con lion herdie  
bien doit estre lvy ho(m)me appelle fol si fie

<sup>3</sup> Lack of space compels me to withhold my comment on Dr. Logeman's argument for our next number.—J.W.B.

home que feme ait en cur com(en)t auroit mesaixe  
 cest vne medessine que de tout malz repaice  
 ons y puet anci estre aseur (et) ai aixe  
 (com) plain poins destoupe en vne airdant fornaixe

M(ou)lt ait de b(ie)n en fem(m)e maix il est si repus  
 a poine lap(er)cevoir le puet oul pot on nus  
 lor science resamble la maixont de daulus  
 pues co(n) y est entreit ne san puet issir nulz

Sor toute riens est feme de muable tallant  
 p(ar) nature vult fair ceu co(n) plux li deffant  
 vne pance autre dit or vult or se repent  
 en son p(ro)po se tient (com) cochet auz vant

Nest par droit ne rapont que dez fem(m)e mesdie  
 saige sont (et) secreit plaine de cortoisie  
 ka (con) die delle fol est que ne si fie  
 tout co(m) pastor auz louf q(ua)nt sa beste est mangiee

Ie voy troy b(ie)n en fem(m)e que m(ou)lt font a loweie  
 ferme sont (et) estauble (et) seue(n)t b(ie)n celleie  
 De riens que on lor die ne se couient douteir  
 ne plux que son estoit en .i. panier en meie

fo. 37 v<sup>o</sup>.

que ne se fie en fa(m)me b(ie)n ait ou cor la raige  
 sa paix (et) son preu heit (et) chaite son damage  
 et (com) plux ly samble humble douce cortoise (et) saige  
 adont te fie en lie auta(n)t (com) chet auz formaige

q(ua)nt vne fe(m)me fait .i. dinetot ou feste  
 sache c(er)tainem(en)t que cest signe de tempeste  
 nait en lie seurteit ne quil ait en la beste  
 que point deuer la cowe (et) blandit de la teste

que (com) fame vult auoir (et) seur (et) sertaint  
 a feme le vait querre ne lautait mie en vain  
 cez co(n)seille est si boin (et) au soir (et) auz main  
 que home nieiet iai hony se fe(m)me ni met la main

The MS. is said to be very difficult to read  
 (as the whole of the poem has been scratched  
 out), and the scribe (a member of the Desch  
 family) must have written it down very care-

lessly, leaving to us abundant opportunity for  
 emendation.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

Johns Hopkins University.



THE TONIC PERSONAL PRONOUN  
*tu>tue>tuo* IN OLD PISTOJESE.

MEYER-LÜBKE in his 'Italienische Grammatik,' §366, in speaking of the tonic personal pronouns says: "für die zweite findet sich bei Albertano<sup>1</sup> durchweg *tuo* nach *io*." I hope to prove, however, that the *o* in *tuo* is an off-glide, developed through *tu>tue>tuo*, either by assimilation, or by analogy to such forms as *più>piùe>piùo*, which occur so frequently in Albertano. As yet I have not been able to find anywhere else examples of *tuo* and *piùo*.

I have collected all the examples in Albertano of final *e>o*, and these fall into two divisions: I. Primary *e>o*; II. Secondary *e>o*.

I. Primary *e>o*: (*tuo*) *dicesto*, p. 59, l. 28; and *aveto* (*decto*), 68-36. Also *puro* occurs twice (*etiamdio puro* (*airisi*), 59-35; (*d'ire*) *puro* (*incontra*), 67-40, while *pure* is found three times and *pur* twice. To show Albertano's fondness for final *o* in forms where *e* may also be used, I might add that *anc(h)o* occurs twenty-eight times, but *anche* and *anch'* (ð) only once, each.

II. Secondary *e>o*: In the first place it may be well to establish the fact, that this *e* is an off-glide, since *tue* occurs only twice and each time it is followed by a syllable whose vowel is *e*.

1. This *e* is of frequent occurrence in Albertano<sup>2</sup> in the following cases:

a. FORMS IN *a+e*.

1. Monosyllables: *dae* 6 times, *da* 1; *vae* 3; *va* 1; *de* 18, *à* 10; *sae* 16, *sa*—; *fae* 33, *fa* 1; *stae* 2, *istà* 1; *giae* 1, *gia* 6.
2. I Fut. 3. s., *de* 20 times, *à* 54.
3. The Pres. subj.: *siae* 1 time, *sia* 49.

b. FORMS IN *i+e*.

*quie* 5 times, *qui*—; *die* (= *dici>di*) 2, *dì* 2; *folie* 1, *foli*—; *vollie* 4, *volli* 6; but *chosie* 4, *chosi* 39.

c. FORMS IN *o+e*.

1. Monosyllables: *doe* 1, *do*—; *soe* 1, *so*—; *de* 8, *ð* 13.

<sup>1</sup> 'Volgarizzamento dei Trattati Morali' di Albertano Giudice di Brescia da Soffredi del Grazia notaro Pistoiese. Fatto innanzi al 1278, Trovato da Sebastiano Ciampi. Firenze, 1832.

<sup>2</sup> Examine only fifty pages.

2. I Fut. 1. s. *de* 2, *ð* 5.
3. I Pret. 3. s. *de* 6, *ð* 11.
4. *altroe* 6, *altro* 23.

d. FORMS IN *u+e*.

*fue* 8, *fu*—.

2. The presence of this glide *e* is also conclusively proved by its constant use in modern Pistoiese. Not to speak of its use after final *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, I shall confine myself to examples of this *e* after *u*. The Pistoiese *contadini* always say *tue*, *fue*, *piùe*, *giùe*, *sue* (> *susum*), *lassue*, etc. Frequent examples are found in other Tuscan dialects: Senese, *piùe*, *giùe*, *tue*, *sùe* (Hirsch, *Zschr. f. r. Phil.*, ix, 536); Florentine, *fue* ('Crest.' 4 24); *tue* (Tancia, 5 911) *piùe* (Lam. di Cec., 6 *giue* (c. Son., 7 7); *Gesue* (50).

Now since this *e* is shown beyond doubt to be an off-glide, may it not, just as primary *e*, develop into *o*?

In order to answer this question let us consider the following developments in Albertano.

1. *rendò* (*lode*) 20-34 is out of *rendée>rendè* as is proved by such forms as *èe*, *potèe*, etc.

2. *più>piùe>piùo*. The form *più* occurs seven times, *piùe* twice and *piuo* sixty-seven times. Of the sixty-seven times that *piuo* is found, it is immediately preceded or followed twenty-nine times by a syllable containing *o*, and in five cases it is followed by the word *tosto* which does not occur once with *più* or *piùe*. Examples: *piuo tosto* 8-38, 21-3, 25-17, 45-13, 47-24; *piuo ode*, 11-23; *molto piuo* 22-11; *chon piuo dolcie* 27-25, 38-8; *piuo suole* 31-9; *piuo fort'* 35-32; *piuo cid* 39-7; *piuo folli* 47-33; *piuo potere* 53-16; *dico piuo* 56-21, 65-18; *piuo potenti* 60-1; *sono piuo potente* 61-7; *alto piuo*, etc. I believe, therefore, that the *o* in *piuo* is due to assimilation first to the preceding *u*, for physiologically and acoustically *o* is a more natural glide than *e* after the labial vowel *u*;

3 I take these examples, all of which I have frequently heard, from my thesis on the Pistoiese dialect, which I hope to publish in the near future.

4 Ernesto Monaci: 'Crestomazia Italiana dei Primi Secoli.' Città di Castello, 1889.

5 Michelangelo Buonarroti il Giovane, 'La Fiera e la Tancia.' Firenze, 1860.

6 Francesco Baldovini: 'Lamento di Cecco da Varlungo.' Firenze, 1817.

7 Puccino: 'Cento Sonetti in Vernacolo Fiorentino.' Firenze, 1890.

that is, the rounding of the lips is kept up and the tongue is lowered so that the resonance chamber is made larger. The next assimilating influence is evidently that of the *o* in syllables immediately preceding or following, beginning probably with the tonic *o* in *tosto* with which it is so frequently used, and finally being used without regard to surrounding vowel sounds.

3. Now let us consider *tu > tue > tuo*. The form *tu* (or *istū*) occurs twenty-four times, *tue* twice and *tuo* (or *istuo*) one hundred and twenty-nine times. Of these examples of *tuo* (or *istuo*) *slū* it is immediately preceded or followed forty-seven times by a syllable containing *o*, and in twenty cases it is used with the negative, which does not occur once with *tu* (or *istū*) or *tue*. Examples: *tuo no(n)* 4-7, 6-31; 10-14, 10-34, 24-19, 25-11, 25-37, 25-40, 30-35, 31-4, 31-36, 32-8, 52-5, 53-13, 53-15, 55-3, 57-30; *non tuo* 8-34, 23-40, 52-37; *tuo potresti* 4-36; *tuo posse* 2-21; *quando tuo* 14-2, 30-35; *tuo lo volessi* 20-6; *questo tuo* 31-4; *tuo fossi* 31-38, etc. We thus see that *tu > tue > tuo* is exactly a parallel case with *piū > piue > piuo*. Now just as *piuo* begins with *tosto*, then is used with *o* in other words, and finally with any vowel sound, why cannot *tuo* begin with the negative, then with any *o* immediately preceding or following, and finally be used without regard to its surroundings?

J. D. BRUNER.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### GERMANIC PHILOLOGY.

*Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*, unter Mitwirkung von K. von Amira, W. Arndt, O. Behaghel, A. Brandl, H. Jellinghaus, K. Th. von Inama-Sternegg, Kr. Kälund, Fr. Kauffmann, F. Kluge, R. Kögel, R. von Liliencron, K. Luick, A. Lundell, J. Meier, E. Mogk, A. Noreen, J. Schipper, H. Schück, A. Schultz, Th. Siebs, E. Sievers, B. Symons, F. Vogt, Ph. Wegener, J. te Winkel, J. Wright, herausgegeben von Hermann Paul, ord. Professor der deutschen Sprache und Literatur an der Universität Freiburg i. B.—I. Lieferung. Mit einer Tafel. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner. 1889, 256 pp. 8vo.

AUF verschiedenen Gebieten der Philologie

nimmt man das Bestreben wahr, den gegenwärtigen Stand der Disciplinen ihrem ganzen Umfange nach in handlicher Form unter Beteiligung einer Reihe von Fachgenossen darzustellen. Ich erinnere z. B. an Iwan Müller's Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft oder Gröber's Grundriss der Romanischen Philologie. Derartige Handbücher sind dem Lernenden und dem grösseren Publicum stets willkommen. Auch die Wissenschaft wird in der Regel dabei gewinnen. Denn Werke dieser Art erleichtern nicht nur den Zugang zu den einzelnen Disciplinen, sondern fast jeder, dem ein Zweig der Wissenschaft zur Bearbeitung anvertraut ist, wird auch seinen Fachgenossen dieses oder jenes Neue zu sagen wissen; und sollte gelegentlich einem der Mitarbeiter der von ihm übernommene Teil ganz misraten sein, so wird dies fast immer durch hervorragende Leistungen anderer, die an dem Werke beteiligt sind, einigermaßen ausgeglichen werden. Eine Gefahr freilich liegt dabei nahe. Jede Darstellung einer Wissenschaft, die von einem einzelnen Gelehrten ausgeht, trägt immer ein mehr oder weniger subjectives Gepräge. Die Gefahr bleibt auch bei der Zerlegung des Gesamtgebietes in einzelne Zweige bestehen. So lange nur ein Werk dieser Art vorhanden ist, müssen wir bei jedem einzelnen Teile darauf gefasst sein, eine einseitige Darstellung zu erhalten, die namentlich Anfänger und Autodidakten nach einer bestimmten Richtung hin beeinflussen kann, welche nicht von allen Fachgenossen, ja vielleicht nicht einmal von der Mehrheit der Fachgenossen geteilt wird. Ich halte es aus diesem Grunde für wünschenswert, dass compendiöse Darstellungen einer Wissenschaft von möglichst verschiedenen Seiten und Richtungen aus unternommen werden. Dann wird sowohl das, worin alle übereinstimmen, wie die noch bestehenden Meinungsverschiedenheiten schärfer hervortreten, und es kann um so mehr bei letzteren auf Einigung der Standpunkte hingearbeitet werden.

Es ist nicht meine Aufgabe, hier zu untersuchen, wie weit Paul's Grundriss—der in demselben Verlage erscheint, wie Gröber's Grundriss und mit letzterem auch in seiner Anlage sich berührt—eine Förderung der Germanischen Philologie bedeutet und wie weit

er ein getreues Bild des jetzigen Standes dieser Wissenschaft bietet. Ich habe es hier nur mit der ersten Lieferung des Werkes zu tun<sup>1</sup> und werde mich bei dieser auf die drei ersten, von Paul bearbeiteten Abschnitte beschränken, die bei weitem den grösseren Teil der Lieferung ausmachen. Sie umfassen i. Begriff und Umfang der Germanischen Philologie (S. 1-8); ii. Geschichte der Germanischen Philologie (S. 9-151); iii. Methodenlehre (S. 152-237).

1. *Begriff und Aufgabe der Germanischen Philologie.* Paul geht bei dem Versuche, den Begriff der Philologie<sup>2</sup> zu bestimmen, mit Recht von der klassischen Philologie aus, die ja diesen Begriff zuerst ausgebildet hat. Dass er nicht einen vollständigen Überblick der bisherigen Definitionen gibt, sondern nur einige der bekanntesten und wichtigsten herausgreift, wird man nicht tadeln. Doch hätte ich erwartet, dass G. Curtius, Leipziger Antrittsvorlesung "Philologie und Sprachwissenschaft" (Leipzig, 1862, abgedruckt in den Kleinen Schriften i, 132 ff.) berücksichtigt, oder wenigstens in das Literaturverzeichnis am Schlusse des Abschnittes aufgenommen wäre.—Ich kann mich mit Paul's Einwendungen gegen frühere Auffassungen meist einverstanden erklären. Mit Recht verwirft er z. B. Boekh's Definition, Philologie sei Erkenntnis des Erkannten. Es handelt sich in der klassischen Philologie nicht nur um Wiedergewinnung des im Altertume Erkannten, sondern auch um das damals Nicht-Erkannte, wenn es im Zusammenhange unserer heutigen Auffassung wesentlich erscheint. Die Alten haben z. B. ihre eigene Sprache immer höchst unvollkommen erkannt; es wäre schlimm, wenn wir uns etwa in der Etymologie der Lateinischen Sprache mit den Ansichten begnügen

<sup>1</sup> Nur diese 1. Lieferung ist mir zur Besprechung in den MOD. LANG. NOTES zugegangen.

<sup>2</sup> Dieser Begriff deckt sich bekanntlich nicht mit dem, welchen das Wort *philology* im Englischen hat, wo es in der Regel im Sinne von "Sprachwissenschaft" gebraucht wird. Für den Begriff der "Philologie" gibt es meines Wissens im Englischen kein entsprechendes Wort. "Science," das zuweilen in diesem Sinne verwandt wird, bietet keinen genügenden Ersatz, denn es bedeutet "Wissenschaft" im weitesten Sinne, oder speciell "Naturwissenschaft." Man wird abwarten müssen, ob etwa *philology* allmählich den Sinn des deutschen "Philologie" annehmen kann.

müssten, welche Varro oder Festus gehegt haben. Wir wollen mit anderen Worten an das Altertum nicht oder wenigstens nicht nur den Massstab der Alten, sondern unsern Massstab legen.—Unhaltbar erscheint auch mir der Versuch Usener's,<sup>3</sup> die Philologie ausschliesslich als eine Methode der Geschichtsforschung zu fassen. Die Konsequenz dieser Auffassung wäre, dass z. B. die Homerischen Gedichte den klassischen Philologen nicht als Gedichte und ihres poetischen Wertes halber interessieren, sondern als Denkmäler, an welchen man Kritik und Hermeneutik üben und sich in der Methode der Geschichtsforschung vervollkommen kann. Griechen und Römer überhaupt wären für den klassischen Philologen nicht in erster Linie Vertreter einer eigenartigen für uns wertvollen Cultur, sondern Urheber von Denkmälern, die für die Methode der Geschichtsforschung besondern Wert haben. Was Homer als Dichter den Alten bedeutete und was er uns bedeutet, welche Stellung die antike Cultur im Zusammenhange der Culturentwicklung einnimmt, und was wir aus ihr lernen können, diese Fragen müsste der Philologe an den Literaturhistoriker und Geschichtsforscher abgeben.<sup>4</sup> Und weiter: der Goethe-Philologe überlässt es anderen, Goethe als Dichter zu würdigen; ihm sind Goethe's Werke nichts als schriftliche Denkmäler, welche ihm Gelegenheit geben, die Methode der Geschichtsforschung auszubilden. Ich glaube, man braucht nur diese Konsequenzen zu ziehen, um zu sehen, dass die Philologie sich nicht als blosses Methode fassen lässt. Es wird damit auch nicht der Zweck erreicht, die Philologie von Wissensgebieten wie Sprachwissenschaft, Geschichte, Literaturgeschichte, Kunstgeschichte in der Weise zu sondern, dass man ersterer die Methode der Geschichtsforschung, letzteren die Forschung selbst zuweist. Denn die letzteren könnten sämtlich mit demselben

<sup>3</sup> Philologie und Geschichtswissenschaft. Bonn, 1882.

<sup>4</sup> Es verdient dabei betont zu werden, dass der Urheber der Definition, gegen die wir uns sträuben, sich in der Praxis nicht nur in Fragen der Hermeneutik und Kritik, sondern auch in literargeschichtlichen und historischen Fragen stets als einer der ausgezeichnetsten Vertreter der klassischen Philologie bewährt hat. Ob er der Meinung ist, den Charakter eines Philologen abgelegt zu haben, sobald er das Gebiet der Kritik und Hermeneutik verlassen hat?



Rechte für bloße Methoden ausgegeben werden, wie die Philologie. Die Sprachwissenschaft z. B. ist nicht nur ein Inbegriff von Kenntnissen, sondern zugleich eine Methode, wenn man will, so gut wie die Philologie, eine Methode der Geschichtsforschung.<sup>5</sup> Wir kämen also vielleicht dahin, die Philologie auch noch ihrer eigenen Methode zu berauben, indem diese Methode sich aus den Methoden der einzelnen geschichtlichen Wissenschaften zusammensetzen würde. Es lässt sich eben auf diesem Wege nicht durchkommen. Die Philologie muss sich von der Sprachwissenschaft, Literaturgeschichte, Kunstgeschichte in anderer Weise abgrenzen lassen.—Ich komme damit zu Paul's Auffassung der Philologie. Paul will jeden Unterschied zwischen der Philologie und den ihr nahe stehenden Wissenschaften wie Sprachwissenschaft, Literaturwissenschaft u. s. w. beseitigt wissen. Die Philologie geht ihm so vollständig in diesen Wissenschaften auf, dass nichts von ihr übrig bleibt, nicht einmal der Name.<sup>6</sup>

„Keiner von den Versuchen, die Philologie als einen besonderen Zweig der Culturwissenschaft zu definieren und gegen die übrigen Zweige abzugrenzen, ist gelungen, und keiner wird gelingen. Wenn man ein System der Culturwissenschaft aufstellen will, wird man das Wort am besten ganz fallen lassen.“

Für Paul fällt die Philologie zusammen mit der „allgemeinen Culturwissenschaft.“ Wenn ich nicht irre, ist ihm dabei nicht nur der Begriff der Philologie, sondern auch der der „historischen“ im Unterschiede von der „allgemeinen“ Culturwissenschaft verloren gegangen. Er nennt S. 5 in einem Atem die Sprachwissenschaft und Literaturwissenschaft „Zweige der allgemeinen Culturwissenschaft“

<sup>5</sup> Man hüte sich vor dem Fehler, die „Methode“ der Sprachwissenschaft, wie jetzt häufig geschieht, mit den „Prinzipien“ der Sprachwissenschaft gleichzusetzen. Es ist derselbe Fehler, als wollte man den Verfasser einer Poetik für einen Dichter halten. Die Methode ist eine Kunst. Wer die besten Grundsätze hat, kann in ihr ein arger Stümper sein.

<sup>6</sup> Hierin geht Paul mit Schuchardt zusammen, der in seiner Schrift über die Lautgesetze meint (S. 37), es werde keine Verständigung zwischen Philologie und Sprachwissenschaft möglich sein, ehe wir uns nicht des Namens „Philologie“ entäußert haben. Ich kann mich mit Schuchardt's treffenden Ausführungen sonst fast durchweg einverstanden erklären, aber seinen Ansichten über die Stellung der Sprachwissenschaft zur Philologie vermag ich mich nicht anzuschließen.

und Wissenszweige, „die einen geschichtlichen Aufbau verlangen, der nach Möglichkeit die Entwicklungsbedingungen erkennen lässt.“ Man muss sich hier erinnern, dass Paul in seinen 'Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte' (S. 3.) die historischen Wissenschaften als „Specialwissenschaft“ bezeichnet; als höchstes Ziel aller Specialwissenschaft erscheint ihm die „Prinzipienwissenschaft“; erst durch diese erhalte die „specielle Geschichtsforschung“ ihren rechten Wert. Aber kann denn die Geschichte sich je in eine Gesetzeswissenschaft verwandeln? Ist nicht z. B. die Literaturwissenschaft als Gesetzeswissenschaft (man nennt sie in diesem Sinne gemeinhin Poetik) das gerade Gegenstück zur Literaturgeschichte? Wird nicht die Lautphysiologie stets einen eigenen Wissenszweig gegenüber der Lautgeschichte bilden? Selbstverständlich kann die Literaturgeschichte die Poetik nicht entbehren, die Lautgeschichte kann nicht ohne Lautphysiologie auskommen. Und umgekehrt muss die Poetik sich auf die Literaturgeschichte, die Lautphysiologie sich auf die Lautgeschichte stützen. Allgemeine und historische Wissenschaften lassen sich Praxis nirgends von einander losreißen. In ihren Zielen sind sie grundverschieden.

Es trifft sich eigentümlich, dass in derselben Zeit, wo die Philologen anfangen, ihrer eigenen Wissenschaft das Recht selbständiger Existenz abzuspochen, die Philosophie beginnt, das Wesen der historischen Kenntnis und den selbständigen Wert der geschichtlichen Wissenschaften voll zu würdigen.

Ich habe hier insbesondere Dilthey's grundlegende 'Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften' im Auge, deren erster Band im J. 1883, zwischen der ersten und zweiten Auflage von Paul's Prinzipien erschienen ist. Dilthey untercheidet (S. 32f.) in den Geisteswissenschaften, drei Classen von Aussagen. „Die einen von ihnen sprechen Wirkliches aus, das in der Wahrnehmung gegeben ist: sie enthalten den historischen Bestandteil der Erkenntnis. Die andern entwickeln das gleichförmige Verhalten von Teilinhalten dieser Wirklichkeit: sie bilden den theoretischen Bestandteil derselben. Die letzten drücken Werturteile aus und schreiben Regeln vor: in ihnen ist der praktische Teil der Geis-



teswissenschaften befasst." Er fügt ausdrücklich hinzu: "Die Auffassung des Singularen, Individualen bildet in ihnen so gut einen letzten Zweck als die Entwicklung abstracter Gleichförmigkeiten." Vielleicht gelangen wir von diesem Standpunkte aus zu einer Begriffsbestimmung der Philologie. Philologie ist nach meiner Auffassung gleichbedeutend mit individueller Culturwissenschaft (nicht allgemeiner Culturwissenschaft, denn diese gehört der zweiten Classe der Geisteswissenschaften an). Es empfiehlt sich jedoch, dabei einen Zusatz zu machen. Wir pflegen den Ausdruck Philologie auf die wissenschaftliche Betrachtung solcher Culturepochen oder Individuen zu beschränken, deren Besonderheit uns in einer Reihe eigentlicher, zusammengehöriger Denkmäler (in erster Linie Schriftdenkmäler) überliefert ist. Befreiung dieser Denkmäler von den Schäden der Überlieferung (Kritik) und Erklärung ihres Inhaltes (Hermeneutik) werden stets die notwendige Grundlage und einen wesentlichen Teil einer jeden Philologie bilden. Darnach möchte ich Philologie etwa definieren als *die an eine Reihe individueller Denkmäler geknüpfte wissenschaftliche Erkenntnis einer individuellen Cultur*. Dieser Auffassung fügt sich der Gebrauch des Wortes Philologie in allen seinen Nuancierungen.<sup>7)</sup> Wir sprechen von klassischer Philologie, indem Griechen und Römer uns als Vertreter einer individuellen und zwar einer "klassischen" Culturepoche erscheinen, und indem wir die von ihnen hinterlassenen Denkmäler als zusammengehörig betrachten. Wir können statt dessen aber auch Griechen und Römer je für sich als eine geschichtliche Einheit fassen und die Denkmäler ihrer Cultur in Griechische und Römische sondern. Wir können noch weiter gehen und z. B. von Homerischer oder Plautinischer Philologie sprechen. Wir haben längst eine Dante-, Shakespeare-, Goethe- und Kant-Philologie. Es liegt in allen diesen

<sup>7)</sup>Paul kann von seinem Standpunkte aus keine klare Bestimmung des Begriffes "Philologie" (die für ihn mit den Geisteswissenschaften überhaupt zusammenfällt) geben. Die Schuld dafür muss bei ihm das Wort "Philologie" tragen:

"Die Vorstellungen, die sich damit verbunden haben, sind von Anfang an nicht genau fixiert gewesen, haben sich allmählich verschoben und sind immer schwankend geblieben. Es ist nicht zu erwarten, dass sich dieselben logisch abgrenzen und systematisieren lassen." (S. 3.)

Verwendungen durchaus keine schwankende oder misbräuchliche Anwendung des Ausdruckes "Philologie," sondern überall liegt dieselbe Anschauung einer geschichtlichen, in eigenartigen Denkmälern überlieferten Individualität zu Grunde. Ich kann Paul durchaus nicht zugeben, dass etwa Kant-Philologie und allgemeine Culturgeschichte ein und dieselbe Sache seien.—Die Philologie scheidet sich von Sprachwissenschaft, Literaturgeschichte u. s. w. natürlich so, dass diese immer nur *eine* Seite der geschichtlichen Wirklichkeit betrachten, während die Philologie die besondere Bedeutung eines Individuums nach *allen* den Seilen, in welchen es in den Zusammenhang der Cultur eingreift, zu erfassen sucht.

HERMANN COLLITZ.

*Bryn Mawr College.*

#### OLD ENGLISH POETRY.

*Cynewulf's Christ. An Eighth Century English Epic.* Edited, with a modern rendering, by Israel Gollancz. London: David Nutt, 1892. 8vo, pp. xxiii, 216.

WHAT paper, print, and binding can do to make an Eighth Century English Epic attractive has been done for this book. In this respect it resembles the Middle English poem, "The Pearl," by the same editor, with the prefatory lines by Lord Tennyson. If a great nation does not care for its own literary past except as rubricated, on rough-surfaced and rough-edged paper, and with chromo-lithographs, it should perhaps be indulged thus far, in the hope of something better. Not that there is anything to object to in the form of the book; on the contrary, its form is in the highest degree tasteful and attractive, and one is only inclined to regret that such accessories are needful to recommend the poem which is now, for the first time, presented to the English public in a separate edition.

Of the text no one who has not collated it with the manuscript is in a position to speak, but the presumption is that it is fairly correct. The line-numbering does not correspond with Grein's, owing to the fact that Grein's fragmentary first line, consisting of but a single word, is omitted, and likewise his conjectural

line 804; accordingly Gollancz's numbering differs by one up to line 804, and by two thereafter, from that usually cited.

The translation is not worse than those to which we are accustomed; perhaps it would be paying it too high a compliment to say that it is very much better. It is paraphrastic rather than literal, and the form of paraphrase seems often to be dictated by rhetorical considerations, so that the beginner would not find it a very safe guide in details. Its melody is, in the main, that of blank verse, but now and again one's teeth are set on edge by passages in a different rhythm and lines of greater length. It is still the reign of experiment in rhythmical translation from Old English; Mr. Brooke's essays in a somewhat new form, from which so much might reasonably have been expected, mark an addition to, rather than an advance upon, those already in existence. A favorable specimen of Gollancz's performance is the following, (ll. 877-881, Gollancz's numbering):

Then, too, from all four corners of the world,  
from furthest regions of the realm of earth,  
resplendent angels shall with one accord  
sound their loud trumpets, and mid-earth shall quake  
beneath the feet of men.

This is of another sort (409-411):

Helm of all things! endless Hosanna be thine  
in the heights above, and noble praise on earth,  
among the hosts of men.

For purposes of comparison, Gollancz's (I) and Brooke's (II) renderings of 849-861 are added:

#### I.

Now 'tis most like as if we fare in ships  
on the ocean-flood, over the water cold,  
driving our vessels through the spacious seas  
with horses of the deep. A perilous way is this  
of boundless waves, and these are stormy seas,  
on which we toss here in this feeble world,  
o'er the deep paths. Ours was a sorry plight,  
until at last we sailed unto this land,  
over the troubled main. Help came to us,  
that brought us to the haven of salvation,  
God's Spirit-Son, and granted grace to us,  
that we might know, e'en from the vessel's deck,  
where we must bind with anchorage secure  
our ocean-steeds, old stallions of the waves.  
O let us rest our hope in that same port,  
which the Lord Celestial opened for us there,  
holy on high, when He to heaven ascended!

#### II.

Now most like it is as if we on lake of ocean,  
O'er the water cold in our keels are sailing,  
And through spacious sea, with our stallions of the Sound,  
Forward drive the flood-wood. Fearful is the stream  
Of immeasurable surges that we sail on here,  
Through this wavering world, through these windy oceans  
O'er the path profound. Perilous our state of life  
Ere that we had sailed (our ship) to the shore (at last),  
O'er the rough sea-ridges. Then there reached us help,  
That to hithe of Healing homeward led us on—  
He the Spirit-son of God! And he dealt us grace,  
So that we should be aware, from the vessel's deck,  
Where our stallions of the sea we might stay with ropes,  
Fast a-riding by their anchors—ancient horses of the waves!  
Let us in that haven then all our hope establish,  
Which the ruler of the Æther there has roomed for us,  
When He climbed to Heaven—Holy in the Highest!

If there is any advantage here, it is on the side of Gollancz.

It is another matter when we come to examine the Glossary. If praise of the translation must be qualified, that of the Glossary must be more qualified still. A few facts with reference to the words *A* which I assume to be typical of the whole, must take the place of general comment. The omission of the proper noun *Adam* (959, 1026), may be accepted as intentional. *Ac* (24 times) and *æfter* (17 times) should, however, at least have been inserted, even if citations were not given. Other words omitted are *æ* (139, 670), *æghwæðer* (1575), *æghwylc* (839, 1316), *ærdon* (463), *æpelcynning* (905), *ágen* (111, 464, 531), *amen?* (438), *anginn* (110), *ascian* (1473), *áwo* (478, 1269). *Atol* is misplaced; it should come after *adloga*. From *awiht* there should be a cross-reference to *ðwihte* (*ðwiht*), instead of the entry of the reference to 342. Under *á* is given one reference; there should be eight: under *æfre* one; there should be twelve: under *ærest*, adv., one; there should be forty-five: under *æt* three; there should be twenty-two: under *án* and *ána* together six; there should be twenty-two, and the 556 under *ána* should be 566. Other citations omitted are: *ácennan*, 108; *æghwaes*, 1503; *ælbeorht*, 879; *ælc*, 405; *ælde*, 779, 935, 954; *ælmihlig*, 940; *ænig*, 177, 183, 199, 240, 682, 1575; *ær*, 38, 44, 601; *ærest*, adj., 224, 354, 1150, 1236, 1336, 1379; *ætsomne*, 583; *æpele*, 605; *áfréfan*, 174; *ágan*, 598; *álýsan*, 1483; *andweard*, 1527, 1539, 1562; *ár* (messenger), 502; *áreccan*, 1123; *árisan*, 466, 1039; *ástigan*, 865; under *ásecgan* dele

1473, which belongs under *ascian* (*ubi supra*); for *āweorþan* read *āweorþan*.

The words of the last twenty-nine lines, which Gollancz separates from the rest, as the true opening of 'Guthlac,' and not belonging to this poem, have not been indexed. Gollancz says (p. xix): "In Appendix I. I have printed fifty-eight lines hitherto regarded as part of the present poem"; the number he does print is twenty-nine, and the numbering on p. 146 makes it thirty-one!

The other appendices and the notes are useful, as is the excursus on the Cynwulf runes.

In the preface (p. xxi), Gollancz confesses that he has failed to discover any original for the First Part, which is as much as to say that he has made no addition to our knowledge of the sources:

"Long and patient search has failed to discover the source of Passus I.; this failure is especially to be deplored as one would wish to know from what original the poet evolved the earliest dramatic scene in English literature. . . . The original of the greater part of Passus I. must, I think, have been a Latin hymn-cycle, the 'Joseph and Mary' section being derived from an undiscovered hymn arranged for recital by half-choirs."

Rather than put us off with this conjecture only, Gollancz might at least, one would think, refer us to the 'Gospel of James' ('Protevangelium Jacobi') as an ultimate source whether the proximate one or not. Since he has failed to do so, I append chap. 13 in Cowper's translation ('Apocryphal Gospels,' pp. 14-15):

"And her sixth month came, and, behold, Joseph came from his housebuilding; and entering his house he found her pregnant. And he smote his face, and threw himself upon the ground on sackcloth, and wept bitterly, saying, With what face shall I look at the Lord my God? and what shall I entreat concerning this damsel? *for I have received her a virgin from the temple of the Lord* (cf. ll. 185-6), and have not kept her. Who hath circumvented me? Who hath done this evil in my house, and defiled the virgin? Is not the history of Adam repeated in me? for just as Adam was at the hour of his thanksgiving, and the Serpent came and found Eve alone, and deceived her, so also hath it befallen me. And Joseph arose from his sackcloth, and called Mary, and said to her, Thou that hast been cared for of God, why hast thou done this, and hast forgotten the Lord thy God? Why

hast thou humbled thy soul, thou that wast brought up in the holy of holies, and didst receive food at the hand of an angel? And she wept bitterly, saying, *I am pure and know no man* (196-9). And Joseph said to her, Whence then is it that thou art pregnant? And she said, As the Lord my God liveth, I know not whence it is come to me."

Interesting parallels are to be found in the 'Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew' (Tischendorf, 'Evangelia Apocrypha', pp. 70 ff.), of which I quote the original Latin:

Part of Chap. 9:

"Altera autem die dum Maria staret iuxta fontem ut urceolum impleteret, apparuit ei angelus domini et dixit: Beata es Maria, quoniam in utero tuo *habitaculum domino* (cf. 205b) *praeparasti*. Ecce *veniet lux de caelo ut habitat in te* (cf. 202-203), et per te universo mundo resplen debet."

The whole of Chap. 10:

"Cum haec agerentur, Ioseph in Capharnum maritima erat in opere occupatus, erat enim faber ligni: ubi moratus est mensibus novem. Reversusque in domum suam invenit Mariam praegnantem. Et totus contremuit et *positus in angustia* (cf. 166 ff.) exclamavit et dixit: Domine deus, accipe spiritum meum, quoniam melius est mihi mori quam vivere. Cui dixerunt virgines quae cum Maria erant: *Quid ais* (cf. 170b), domine Ioseph? *Nos scimus quoniam vir non tetigit eam* (cf. 197 ff.); nos scimus quoniam integritas et *virginitas in ea immaculate perseverat* (cf. 186, 210). Nam custodita est a deo, semper in oratione vobiscum permansit; cotidie cum ea angelus domini loquitur, cotidie de manu angeli escam accipit. Quomodo fieri potest ut sit aliquod peccatum in ea? Nam si suspicionem nostram tibi vis ut pandamus, istam gravidam non fecit nisi angelus dei. Ioseph autem dixit: Ut quid me seducitis ut credam vobis quia angelus domini impraegnavit eam? Potest enim fieri ut quisquam se finxerit angelum domini et deceiverit eam. Et haec dicens *flebat* (cf. 171b-172a) et dicebat: Qua fronte ad templum dei iturus sum? Qua facie visurus sum sacerdotes dei? Quid facturus sum? Et haec dicens cogitabat occultare se et *dimittere eam* (cf. 165, 166a)."

Part of Chap. 12:

"Factum est autem post haec et exiit rumor quod Maria esset gravida. Et comprehensus a ministris templi Ioseph ductus est ad pontificem, qui una cum sacerdotibus coepit *exprobrare ei* (cf. 168 ff., 180 ff.) et dicere: Ut quid fraudatus es nuptias tantae ac talis virginis, quam angeli dei sicut columbam *in templo* (cf. 185) nutrierunt, quae virum numquam nec videre voluit, quae in lege dei eruditionem

optimam habuit? Tu autem si ei violentiam non fecisses, illa hodie virgo perseverasset. Ioseph autem devotabat se iurans quod numquam tetigisset eam."

Other sources may probably also be assumed, as, for 206<sup>b</sup>, Luke i. 35.

If Cynewulf be indeed the author of the present arrangement and the existing form of the dialogue, it is not the least of his claims to literary distinction; but this is a question which may well be left in abeyance, pending further investigation into the matter. The most troublesome part of the Joseph and Mary episode is now 175<sup>b</sup> to 180<sup>a</sup>, for which neither of the Apocryphal Gospels seems to have a germinal passage.

Gollancz gracefully dedicates his book to Professor Skeat: *Magistro Discipulus*.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

#### TEXT CRITICISM.

*France, Franceis & Franc* im Rolandsliede, von Dr. CARL TH. HOEFFT. Strassburg: Carl J. Trübner, 1891 pp. 74, 8vo.

In the *Revue des questions historiques*, vol. vii, pp. 84, seq. (1869) Gautier claimed that the author of the 'Chanson de Roland' in using the words "dolce France" had in mind

"notre France du Nord avec ses frontières naturelles du côté de l'Est, et ayant pour tributaire toute la France du midi"

and, also, the Germano-French empire of Charlemagne. Dr. Hoefft shows that none of the French contemporaries of the author of the 'Chanson,' or writers of a somewhat later period, used the term "France" in the first of these meanings; that by "France" they meant the country North of the Loire known as the Duchy of France (or Francia), in fact the state of Hugo Capet and his successors; and, further, that the frequent reference of the poet to the Carolingian empire strongly points towards an older poem written at a period when the existence of that Empire was still fresh in the minds of people without learning. Gautier's view finds seeming support in the Baligant episode (Str. 220) with which Str. 277 (Judges of Ganelon) by no means coincides, and which is clearly an in-

terpolation of a later writer. The 'Chanson' as we now know it, was very probably a reworking of an older poem, and this appears all the more certain as the poet of our 'Chanson de Roland' had no special education. That his notions were confused appears, for instance, from the mention he makes of Aix-la-Chapelle which no French writer ever considered a French city, probably confounding this city with the city of Laon. In v. 2909 we read:

Amis Rolanz, jo m'en irai en France;  
cum je serai à Loun en ma chambre,

while a little further on (v. 2916, etc.) he says:

Amis Rolanz, pruzdœm, juvente bele,  
Cum je serai a Ais en ma chapelle.

Gautier made the mistake of attributing to a writer of the eleventh century who had no learning, a double conception of France; first, as the Duchy of Francia, secondly as the Germano-French empire;—while a more discriminating examination of the different uses of this word in the poem would have forced him to admit that they are due to different writers. At the time of Charlemagne there was, of course, no Duchy or Kingdom of Francia. A poet of that time would have spoken of Charles the Great as the Emperor of the Franks who ruled over both Gaul and Germany. A writer of the eleventh century had before him a definite country with well-defined limits, and to him Charlemagne was simply a French King, and France the state of the Capetian dynasty. This was the conception of his contemporaries none of whom, when speaking of Charlemagne, fail to make it plain that Charles *leaves France* when he passes beyond the Loire southward and enters Burgundy or Lorraine, etc. For these writers other countries, as Normandy, Lorraine, etc., exist as distinct from France, and while they refer to them as in some sort tributary to Charles, they do not represent them as parts of France.

After Gautier, P. Rajna touched on the foregoing subject in his 'Le origini dell'Epopea Francese' (p. 368, etc., seq.) agreeing in some respects with Hoefft without, however, clearing up the difficulty. Rajna inclines to the belief that the mixing of the historical and topo-



graphical views of France in the epics is to be explained by a reminiscence of a meaning which the *Monachus Sangallensis* declares himself willing to connect with the term *Francia*. But the *Monachus Sangallensis*, when he made his terminology, had no reason to fear that a misunderstanding would arise, because at his time *Francia*, as the Duchy of *Francia*, did not yet exist. It was different with the writers of France of a later period. They were limited by then existing facts. Had they ignored these facts they would have made a mistake, like to the statement of a writer who would designate England (the southern state of the island) as the United Kingdom (England, Scotland, Ireland). The case could be put even more strongly if we conceive that a British poet of the fifteenth century had at one time spoken of England in the specific sense, and again as England with its dependencies in France as one country.

Whether or not the 'Chanson de Roland' represents the work of different authors writing at different times, and especially whether it contains remnants of a very ancient poem dating back to 843 or farther, can only be decided by a careful and impartial study. It was an unfortunate slip on the part of Gautier to refer to the "natural frontiers" of France in discussing the 'Chanson de Roland,' and it is interesting to note that the remark was made in 1869. The poem is a masterpiece of literature requiring careful literary criticism and sober common sense in the detailed study of it.

C. A. EGGERT.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### GOTHIC TEXTS.

*The First Germanic Bible*, translated from the Greek by the Gothic bishop Wulfila in the fourth century, and the other remains of the Gothic language. Edited, with an introduction, a syntax, and a glossary, by G. H. BALG, Ph. D., author of a comparative glossary of the Gothic language, and editor of the English edition of Braune's Gothic grammar. New York: B. Westermann & Co., 1891, pp. 469.

The need of a new edition of the Gothic texts may well be questioned, as there are

several German editions, neater in print and cheaper in price than the one before us. But as an additional proof of the fact that the scientific study of English is beginning to take a firm foothold in America, we may welcome this first English edition of the remains of the Gothic language. The editor has had to contend with all the disadvantages of lack of a library necessary for scientific work; many of the shortcomings are due to these unfavorable circumstances. A visit to one of the larger institutions would have remedied some of these defects; yet as none of them is serious enough to impair the usefulness of the book, and judging that enthusiasm and zeal ought to count for something—we need too much of it not to be cautious in criticism—we want to express our recognition of Dr. Balg's scholarly efforts.

In spite of the great care taken in the preparation of this edition, a number of mistakes and misprints are to be found in it, especially in the Introduction,—p. xv. The number of extant leaves of the Codex Argenteus seems to meet with a strange fatum. Gabelentz and Loebe give the number as one hundred and eighty-eight (originally three hundred and thirty), of which eleven leaves were stolen; Heyne follows this calculation even in his eighth edition; Bernhardt deducts another ten; Braune corrects the mistake in the third edition of his grammar, after Ignaz Peters had published the result of his careful recount (cf. *Germania*, xxx, p. 314). Wright copies Heyne, and so does Balg in spite of quoting Peters' article for reference!—p. xviii. In the bibliography, ad 9, we miss: 'Gothicae Versionis Epistolarum divi Pauli ad Thessalonicenses secundae, ad Timotheum, ad Titum, ad Philemonem, quae supersunt,' edidit C. O. Castillionæus, Mediolani, 1839.—Ad 12: Gabelentz and Loebe's edition appeared in 1843-1846. (Goedeke, who is very unreliable in his dates, gives 1836-1846).—Ad 19: Uppström's edition of Ezra and Nehemia was published in 1864-68.—Ad 21: A second edition of Bosworth's Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels appeared in 1874.—Ad 23: L. Stamm died in 1861; the second edition appeared in 1860; the third edition (1865) was prepared by Heyne; the eighth appeared in 1885 (not 1888).—Ad 24:

If Hoppe and Mueller's unscholarly edition of the *Evangelium Marci* deserves mention, A. Schaefer's 'Aivaggeljo thairh Maththaiu,' c. v-vii, Waldshut, 1881, ought also to have been admitted.

The text is a reprint of Bernhardt's second edition, as shown by the identity of several typographical errors—II Kor. vi, 8, Note: *jah pairh* in A, not *jap*. II Kor. v, 12, Note: *jan ni in hairtin* in A, not *jah*.—Ephes. iii, 13, Note: *in pizei* in B, to be omitted.—Glossary, sub *anafilh*: *anafilhis bókó*, not *bókós*. Further corrections are: P. 5, Note 13, *wigss* instead of *wiggs*.—P. 11. Math. xxv, 39: *jah atiddjedum*.—P. 18, Note 18, add: *Johannes* in C. A.—P. 32, v. 50. Heyne has *sijaip*.—P. 71, v. 58. Uppström, Gab.-Loebe, and Zahn have: *jäh gap du imma Jesus*, as required by the text.—P. 77, v. 6; add to the Note: *qipeip* in C. A. for *qepeip*.—P. 82, v. 29. About the emendation at *fairgunja*, cf. Mourek, "Gothische Praepositionen."—P. 100. Note 33: the first *i* in *greitandein* is erased in C. A., according to Uppström.—P. 125, c. iv, v. 5: *jap pan*, instead of *jah pan*.—P. 126, c. vi, v. 1: insert *jah* before *ni*. c. vii, v. 5, *ungahobainais*, for *ungahobeinais*.—P. 146, c. ix, v. 15, Note: *unusspillidons*, for *unosspillidons*. c. x, v. 2: *bidjan* in B., not *bidjam*.—P. 162, Note: *frijapwa* in A. belongs to verse 19.—P. 183. Note 17 must read: *frumei* in B.

In the glossary, several words are omitted.—P. 345. *gablindnan*, though occurring only in a gloss in A, ought to have been given (cf. *sihu*).—P. 350, *gakunnan*, w. and str. v.—P. 414, *saurga*, f.—P. 415, *sifan*, w. v.—P. 465, *vulan* is given as a strong verb (following Heyne); a question mark would have called attention to an unsettled point.—Misprints are, on p. 299: *Aillam* (cf. Heyne!) instead of the correct form *Ailam*, as in the text; Gabelentz and Loebe give the former in their text without comment; p. 346, *gadiliggs*, not *gadilliggs*.

A new feature of this edition is a syntax, pp. 222-292. Most of the material is drawn from dissertations and journal articles; a complete bibliography would have been helpful to the student. In the arrangement of his material, the author follows the time-honored classical scheme. No attempt is made towards a com-

parative study, although classical influences are occasionally mentioned. We do not wish to find fault with Dr. Balg either for the plan or the scope of his work; a work on syntax, particularly when the author must often choose between avoiding and touching upon ground not yet fully investigated, offers so many points where to apply the lever of criticism, that reviewers have unfortunately too often been betrayed into making agreement with their own point of view their test of merit. Dr. Balg's intention was to gather the most essential facts of Gothic syntax. In this he has succeeded; yet we think that a less liberal supply of illustrations and translations would not have detracted from the usefulness of the book. The space might have been profitably used for a fuller discussion of principles. We reserve a full review of this part of the edition for a later number of the Notes.

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

University of Mississippi.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

##### TWO CHAUCER NOTES.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In the note to l. 24 of the 'Reeve's Prologue,' Bell's edition, Mr. Jephson points out that the line is apparently derived from a similar expression in the 'Decameron,' in the Introduction to the Fourth Day. It has not, I believe, been noticed that Rabelais has it also, having probably borrowed it from Boccaccio. In Book 3, chap. 28, where Panurge is replying to Friar John, he says:

"Tu me reproches mon poil grisonnant, et ne considere point comment il est de la nature des pourraux, esquelz nous voyons la teste blanche et queue verte, droicte, et vigoureuse";

as given in the 'Edition Variorum,' vol. 5, p. 30. The editors of the Variorum seem to know nothing of the occurrence of the simile in either Boccaccio or Chaucer.

Several commentators have explained whence Chaucer drew his allusion to Plato, 'Prologue' 741-2 (cf. a similar quotation in the 'Manciple's Tale,' C. T. (Tyrrw.) 17156-9, (Gillman) 18088-91):

Eek Plato seith, who so kan hym rede,  
 "The wordes moote be cosyn to the dede."

They all refer to Boethius, but none of them instances the Platonic original. This, however, is 'Timæus' 29 B, which is thus translated by Jowett:

"And in speaking of the copy and original we may assume that words are akin to the matter which they describe; when they relate to the lasting and permanent and intelligible, they ought to be lasting and unfailing, and so far as in their nature is irrefutable and immovable—nothing less. But when they express only the copy or image and not the eternal things themselves, they need only be probable and analogous to the real words."

The Ciceronian translation of the same passage is interesting (ed. Baiter-Kayser 8, 132):

"Omni orationi cum iis rebus, de quibus explicat, videtur esse cognatio: itaque cum de re stabili et immutabili disputat oratio, talis sit, qualis illa, quæ neque redargui neque convinci potest; cum autem ingressa est imitata et efficta simulacra, bene agi putat. si similitudinem veri consequatur."

#### A NOTE ON THE 'BEOWULF.'

There is a gnomic sentence in 'Beowulf' which has never, I believe, been traced to a possible source. I refer to the well-known

*Wyrð oft nered  
 unscēgne eorl, ðonne his ellen dēah!*

This ('Beow.' 572-3) is Christianized in 'Andreas' (458-460) into

*Forþam ic ðow tō sōðe secgan wille,  
 þæt næfre forlæteð lifigende god  
 eorl on eorðan gif his ellen dēah.<sup>1</sup>*

Now is not this our familiar "Fortune favors the brave," which, as every one is aware, is the English rendering of a Latin proverbial expression? (See the amusing treatment in Newman, 'The Idea of a University,' Elementary Studies, Composition). It is found in Terence, 'Phormio' 1. 4. 26; Cicero, 'Tusc. Disp.' 2. 4. 11; with which compare Ennius, quoted in Macrobius, 'Saturn.' 6. 1; Virgil, 'Æn.' 10. 284; Ovid, 'Met.' 10. 586, 'Ars Amor.' 1. 608; 'Fasti' 2. 782; Pliny, 'Epist.' 6. 16; Tibullus 1. 2. 16. It will be observed that some of these authors have "Fortuna,"

<sup>1</sup> See also Gummere: 'Germanic Origins,' p. 236.—J. W. B.

and some "deus," corresponding respectively to the "Wyrð" and "god" of 'Beowulf' and 'Andreas.'

Chaucer takes up the tale in his turn. Thus in 'Troilus and Cryseyde' 572-4 (Morris' ed.):

Thynk ek, Fortune, as wel thi-selven wooste,  
 Helpeth hardy man unto his emprise,  
 And weyveth wrechcs for hire cowardyse.

Still closer in the 'Legend of Good Women' 1773 ('Lucretia' 94):

'Hap helpeth hardy man alday,' quod he.

Further references may be found in Haeckel, 'Das Sprichwort bei Chaucer,' p. 5.

I may note, by the way, that the "stille as stoon," for which Haeckel (pp. 55, 56) can find no parallel, may be from the Bible, Exod. 15, 16. Compare Keats, 'Hyperion' 1. 4:

Sat gray-haired Saturn, quiet as a stone.

Haeckel (p. 15) is all astray in his notes on the 'Prologue,' 741 ff.

#### "DEWY-FEATHERED."

Brooke, in his 'History of Early English Literature,' illustrates Cynewulf by Shelley. On page 183 occur these words:

"Shelley, who was himself an ancient Nature-worshipper born out of due time, a maker of Nature-myths, and as innocent as a young Aryan in doing so, is on that account very like Cynewulf when both are writing about natural phenomena. Both of them write as the people talked in old time about the Wind, and the Clouds, and the Sea."

An independent observation to the same purport is obligingly furnished me by my colleague, Professor McLaughlin. He had noted the fact that Shelley contains a parallel to a passage in Old Norse Helgi Poet—so called by Vigfusson and Powell. In 'Helgi and Sigrun,' ll. 323-326 ('Corpus Poeticum Boreale,' vol. 1, p. 143) we have:—

*Nú em ek svá fegin fundi okkrom,  
 sem át-frekir Óðins haukar,  
 es val vito, varmar bráðir,  
 eða dögg-littir dags-brún síð.*

This they translate: "I am as glad to meet

<sup>1</sup> Vigfusson and Powell use, instead of the *ð* of this word, a conjoined *a* and *o*, which does not occur in ordinary fonts of type.

thee as are the greedy hawks of Woden when they scent the slain, their warm prey, or dew-spangled espy the brows of dawn." Professor McLaughlin had brought this into relation with Shelley's verses from the 'Lines written among the Euganean Hills,' which I here subjoin:—

Mid the mountains Euganean  
I stood listening to the pæan  
With which the legions rooks did hail  
The sun's uprise majestic;  
Gathering round with wings all hoar,  
Through the dewy mist they soar  
Like gray shades, till the eastern heaven  
Bursts, and then, as clouds of even,  
Flecked with fire and azure, lie  
In the unfathomable sky.  
So their plumes of purple grain,  
Starred with drops of golden rain,  
Gleam above the sunlight woods,  
As in silent multitudes  
On the morning's fitful gale  
Through the broken mist they sail,  
And the vapors cloven and gleaming  
Follow down the dark steep streaming,  
Till all is bright, and clear, and still,  
Round the solitary hill.

The Old Norse poetical epithet, thus illustrated, is found nowhere else in the Icelandic poetry, but the connection with the Old English *deawigfeðere* and *úrígfeðere* will be instantly suggested to every student of our elder poetry. The essential poetic quality of much of our Old English verse is beginning to be insisted upon by students of literature, but that, and the close observation of nature by the Old English bards, have perhaps never, within the same compass, received a more striking illustration than that afforded by this parallel. Whether it has already been noted by Sweet, in his essay on Shelley, I am ignorant, as the latter is not accessible to me.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

#### GOthic EMENDATIONS.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In the Gothic version of Luke, ch. iv, v. 36, occurs a passage apparently corrupt, all the editions having, *Jah warþ afslauþnan allans*. The Greek has, καὶ ἐγένετο θαμβός ἐπὶ πάντας. I propose as an emendation, *Jah warþ afslauþn ana allans*, with the addition of a single letter. There are eight a's in

the clause, which makes it plausible that one might have been omitted, and the passage as restored becomes a word-for-word translation, as usual. The neuter *afslauþn* would thus be the equivalent of θαμβός.

WM. STRUNK, JR.

Cornell University.

Mr. Strunk's example tempts me to offer another emendation, although with some misgivings. Mark iv, 5 reads: *in þizeī ni habaida diupaizos airpos*. This is not the word-for-word rendering that we should expect for διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς.

I, therefore, propose the reading *diupa izos airpos* 'depth of the earth.' To this there are two objections. First, the word *\*diupa* (str. fem. like *giba*) is not found; only *diupei* and *diupipa*. Unfortunately the Matthew-parallel to this parable has not been preserved in Gothic. The Greek is the same in both gospels. Not without significance, however, is the Old English rendering of Matt. xiii, 6: *hig næfdon þære eorpan dypan* (*hyo næfdon þære eorðan deopan*); the *izos* in Gothic would correspond to the English *þære*, *pare*. A strong fem. *deop*, *diup* is not found in English, Bosworth-Toller notwithstanding. All the citations in B-T are good only for a neuter *deop* or a weak fem. *deope* or *diepe*, (with i-Umlauf). Still I see no à priori objections to a G. T. *\*deupā*. Balg, in §25 of the grammar appended to his Wulfila text, has collected numerous instances of Gothic verbs governing the genitive. But the verbs are all expressive of tasting, enjoying, sharing, etc. Two examples are cited for *haban*: the passage in question and Matt. ix. 36: *lamba ni habandona hairdeis*. Here Balg interprets *hairdeis*=care of a shepherd. Plainly it is an instance of a dependent genitive. But with regard to Mark iv. 5, the reader should note how slavishly the translator has followed the Greek, for example, in verse 1: *Swaswe ina galeipandan in skip gasitan in marein*=ὅτε αὐτὸν ἐμβάντα εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καθῆσθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ. Also v. 4: *ni habaida airpa managa*=οὐχ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν and v. 6: *unte ni habaida waurtins*=διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν ἐξεραίνθη. Why *haban* should govern the accusative in vv. 4 and 6, and the genitive in v. 5, I fail to see.

J. M. HART.



## SCŪR-HEARD.

Last summer Professor J. W. Pearce wrote to me, inquiring if I had any references that would throw light on this obscure word. I replied that I had none; the word was a crux to me as to every one else. But in reading his paper (NOTES for November), a new interpretation suggested itself. The day before, while working on a different subject, I had had occasion to consult Lumby's 'Be Domes Dæge', p. 16. There I stumbled upon the line 264: *ne þær hagul scuras hearde mid snawe*. (This is wanting in the variant text in Wulfstans' Homilies, ed. Napier, p. 139). It occurred to me, then, to put *scūrheard* and *hagul-scuras hearde* together for the purposes of interpretation. Can there be any objection to regarding *heard* as expressive of the sensation produced upon the human body? Or any objection to regarding *scūr* as illustrative of the stinging sensation produced by a storm, whether of hail, or of arrows, or of swords? I would propose, therefore, to interpret *scūrheard* as=sharp, cutting like a storm. In good American we might render by "blizzard-sharp," an epithet which the prairie man would doubtless pronounce highly suggestive. And *hagul-scūras hearde* we might render by "cutting showers of hail."

The objection which I make, and doubtless most of the readers of the NOTES have made, to Professor Pearce's interpretation of *scūrheard* is that it lowers the meaning of *scūr* from "storm" to "standing water." Also, it takes away from the compound *scūrheard* all its poetic force, and makes it tamely literal. Whereas the conception of a weapon, or weapons, as lashing with the ceaseless fury of a storm is highly poetical.

J. M. HART.

Cornell University.

## SCŪRHEARD.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In the recent discussion in your columns of the word *scūrheard* it would seem that insufficient heed has been given to Müllenhoff's note on *scarpēn scūrim* in line 64 of the "Hildebrandslied,"—'Denkmäler,' 3rd. ed., ii, p. 16-17, or 2nd ed., p. 263. Körner, to be sure,

prints the whole note within his own, but since Mr. Pearce does not exactly and particularly mention Müllenhoff's interpretation,—"*scūrum* oder *scūrheard* heisst das schwert nur, weil es sich im kampf, in *scūrum*, als hart bewährt"—one can not be sure that he had carefully considered it, as it certainly deserves to be.

Why is not this interpretation of Müllenhoff's the true one? It easily satisfies the two principles of Mr. Pearce; both elements are duly considered and the meaning is in accordance with fact. For the first component we have the same meaning in Old German and in Old Norse, while the second component is regularly used of the sword and of other weapons. What is more natural than that a sword be hard in battle? Is it not after all too wide a leap from the usual meaning of *scūr* and its kin, especially in any connection involving thought of a battle or a weapon, to rain-water standing in a tub within a smithy?

ARTHUR H. PALMER.

Yale University.

## "TEAM."

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—A very curious provincialism current here is the use of "team," as is apparent from the following extract from the *Halifax Herald*, Jan. 10, 1893.

"He (the runaway horse) guaged the distance exactly and swung into the stable at a rattling clip, doing no injury beyond slightly *scratching the varnish on a team* standing on the street. The escape from damage was remarkable."

"Team" is the general term for vehicle, the English "trap," Scotch "Machine," Ontario "rig." "Team," in Ontario, always means two horses, and draught horses, used in farm work or hauling. There we have also the word "teamster" for the man who drives the heavy lumber waggon. A "team" of driving horses is a "span."

I have often heard the term used in speech, "Won't you let us take you in our team (carriage)?" but I have never before seen it in print.

ARCHIBALD MACMECHAN.

Dalhousie College, Halifax, N. S.

## JOHN SHAKESPEARE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—John Shakespeare, according to Halliwell Phillips,<sup>1</sup> was a glover; and also probably sold the carcasses of the sheep and cattle he slaughtered.

In 1578, he seems to have met with reverses. Fleay<sup>2</sup> sums up the evidence of his poverty in the following paragraph:

"In 1578, Asbies, his [John Shakespeare's,] wife's inheritance, was mortgaged to Edward Lambert, who was security for him to Roger Sadler for a debt of £5. He was excused from a poor-rate of 4d. a week. In 1579 a levy on him for soldiers was left unpaid."

The case may then be stated: John Shakespeare possessed of cattle; ruined in 1578; whose ruin, judged by the sympathetic remittance of the fines, was generally regarded a misfortune.

The chief misfortunes to Stratford up to the present time, have been caused by floods. Quitler-Couch<sup>3</sup> says, speaking about Stratford floods,

"The highest is dated at the beginning of this century . . . take the level of this with your eye, and you will wonder that any of Stratford is left standing."

Can John Shakespeare's cows be connected with an ancient flood?

In Harrison's "Chronologie,"<sup>4</sup> I find the following:—

"1578. A cold winter, & are long there falleth a great snow in England, whose driftes, in many places, by reason of a Northeast winde, were so deepe that the mere report of them maie seeme incredible. It beganne in the 4th of feb: & held on untill the 8 of the same moneth; during which time some men & women, beside cattell, were lost, & not heard of till the snow was melted & gone. . . . Upon the xjth also of that moneth, the Thames did rise so highe, after the dissolution of this snow, that westminster hall was drowned."

When the Thames invaded Westminster Hall, we may reasonably conclude that the Avon would not be behindhand in flooding Stratford.

HENRY H. HAY.

Girard College Philadelphia.

<sup>1</sup> 'Outlines' p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> 'Introduction to Shakespearian Study,' p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> 'The Warwickshire Avon,' p. 74.

<sup>4</sup> Harrison's 'Description of England,' 2, vi.

## GERMANIC SLIHTA.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—I beg to acknowledge that—as I find to day—the etymology of *slaihts*=*slik-tó* has already been suggested by Johansson in *P. B. B.*, xiv, p. 321. I quoted the word mainly as a new example of Idgrm. *š*: Germanic *ž*, cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES vii, p. 345; Johansson mentions it in a different connection, deriving Germanic *slihta* from Idgrm. *zglihto* which, either in the Idgrm. languages separately, or in Idgrm. itself, became *slikto*.

GUSTAF E. KARSTEN.

Indiana University.

## BRIEF MENTION.

The publishing house of Mr. W. R. Jenkins continues its good services to teachers of Italian by furnishing them with a handy reprint of Edmondo de Amici's interesting little story, 'Camilla' (pp. 125, 35 cents). A few notes, mostly translations, by Professor Comba scarcely give anything that would not be found in an ordinary dictionary. Small books of this nature are exactly what every teacher of Italian most sadly needs, and it is to be hoped that the present little volume will soon be followed by others of a similar nature.

We have received from Messrs. Macmillan & Co. a copy of Corneille's 'Polyeucte,' edited by Dr. Brauholtz. This is a valuable addition to our list of French classics edited for the use of schools and colleges. The introduction comprises a concise and accurate life of Corneille, an analysis of the play, and a study of the metre of 'Polyeucte.' The notes are interesting, and are literary, grammatical, and sometimes philological. The only criticism that can be made of the book is that the notes are probably too full. It is not necessary to call the attention of the student to every little difference between the language of the seventeenth century and that of the nineteenth. It is better to refer to the most important points in the play edited, and to leave the student to read the work without being interrupted too often by notes of minor importance. Every student at the college reads several plays of

the seventeenth century, and if he reads well annotated editions with fewer notes, he will understand the language of the period more easily and better than in editions where it is attempted to bring out, at once, all the points of difference between the language of Corneille and Racine and that of Lamartine and Hugo.

J. Y. Sargent's 'Grammar of the Dano-Norwegian Language' (Clarendon Press, 1892) is altogether the best practical Scandinavian handbook in English. It is based on an earlier work by the same author, published in 1865, intended for English and American tourists in Norway. In the present expansion, while the original purpose is constantly kept in view, the readers of Ibsen and Bjørnson are also provided for. The general plan is well conceived and skilfully carried out. Beginning with the Norwegian pronunciation of Danish, the author passes on to accidence. The discussion of the substantive and the article is characterized by a thoroughness and correctness rather unusual in a work of this kind. Some few loose statements occur, as those on the contraction of the terminations *-el*, *-en*, *-er*, but a careful scrutiny shewed us actual mistakes. The examples throughout are numerous and well-chosen, though it would have been better had the quotations from Norwegian and Danish writers been distinguished, or better still, perhaps, had the latter been entirely omitted. An attempt to discuss the twofold use of Danish almost inevitably leads to confusion. An occasional explanation of differences between the two, such as that of the numerals, is, however, desirable. The author has succeeded perfectly in avoiding that too common fault of practical grammars, the superficial and inappropriate introduction of philological discussion. The list of Norwegian idioms is particularly helpful, so helpful, indeed, that we should be inclined to quarrel with its compiler for not giving us more of them.

The book can be heartily recommended to all those intending to take up the practical study of Norwego-Danish. (8 vo, 172 pp.)

Professor F. M. Warren is delivering a course of six lectures at Adelbert College

(Cleveland, Ohio) on "French Realistic Novels." The special subjects are as follows: i. Beginnings of Realism; Stendhal;—ii. Mérimée, Balzac; iii. Balzac,—iv. Balzac, Charles de Bernard;—v. Minor Realists, the Naturalists;—vi. Flaubert.—These lectures will be followed with a course on "Modern German Fiction" by Professor R. Waller Deering, who will treat the following topics:

i. Introduction; Older Historical Novel: Hauff; Alexis; English Influence—ii. Revolutionary Fiction; Gutzkow; Laube; Jung Deutschland—iii. Village Story (*Dorfschichte*); Immermann; Auerbach—iv. Later Historical Novel; Scheffel; Freytag; Ebers; Eckstein—v. The Short Story; Heyse; Stifter; Storm—vi. Society Novel; Spielhagen; Heyse.

#### PERSONAL.

Mr. Edwin W. Bowen Ph. D. (J. H. U.) is now assistant professor of English in the State University of Missouri, (Columbia). Mr. Bowen's early training was received at Randolph-Macon College, Virginia, where he received the degree of A. M. in June, 1889. During the academic year 1887-88 he was principal of a classical school at Middleburg, Va. After a course of three years at the Johns Hopkins University, he received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in June 1892; his dissertation is entitled "An Historical Study of the ē-vowel in English."

Dr. A. Macmechan, Professor of English at Dalhousie College, Halifax, N. S., announces that among the papers of the late Professor James De Mill, author of 'The Dodge Club,' 'Cord and Crease,' 'A Strange Manuscript Found in a Copper Cylinder,' etc., there has been found a MS. poem of over a thousand lines, entitled 'Behind the Veil.' The poem is said to be the best piece of work ever done by the author. Dr. Macmechan will edit it, and it will be published in a limited edition, "for and on account of Mrs. De Mill," by Messrs. T. C. Allen & Co., Halifax, N. S.



## JOURNAL NOTICES.

**PHONETISCHE STUDIEN. VI. BAND, I. HEFT.**—Wagner, Ph., Französische quantität (unter vorführung des albrecht'schen apparats).—Lenz, Dr. Rudolf, Chilenische studien. II., III.—Araujo, F., Recherches sur la phonétique espagnole. (Suite).—Rambeau, A., Die offiziellen anforderungen in bezug auf die sprechfertigkeit der lehrer der neueren sprachen und die realen verhältnisse.—Zerglebel, Emil H., Grammatik und natürliche spracherlernung.—Lloyd, R. J., E. Th. True and Otto Jespersen. Spoken English: everyday talk, with phonetic transcription.—Aug. Western, Kurze darstellung der englischen aussprache für schulen und zum selbstunterricht.—Gärtner, F. Technischer, Beiträge zur geschichte der französischen und englischen phonetik und phonographie.—Morf, H., L. Clédat, Précis d'orthographe et de grammaire phonétiques pour l'enseignement du français à l'étranger.—Hoffmann-Krayer, H., Nachträgliches zur physiologie der akzentuation. Eine entgegnung.—Sturmfels, K., Zur reform des neusprachlichen unterrichts.—Victor, W., Fünfter allgemeiner deutscher neuphilologentag in Berlin. W., W., Unsere "neue methode" in England. II.

**ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN UND LITTERATUREN. LXXIX. BAND, I. HEFT.**—Biltz, Karl, Wer hat das Lied 'Herr Christ, der einig Gott's Sohn, Vaters in Ewigkeit' gedichtet? Eine Skizze aus der Reformationszeit.—Leitzman, Albert, Ungedruckte Briefe George Forsters. II.—Dieter, F., Arthur Henry Hallam.—Tanger, Gustav, Zur Lautschriftfrage.—Speyer, Fr., Auswahl deutscher Gedichte für die unteren und mittleren Klassen höherer Knabenschulen von Dr. F. Otto.—Speyer, Fr., Beiträge zum deutschen Unterrichts von Arthur Corsenn. Beilage zum Oster-Programm der höheren Bürgerschule und des Progymnasiums zu Geestemünde.—Mangold, W., Methode Schliemann zur Erlernung fremder Sprachen, herausgeg. von Paul Spindler. Englisch bearbeitet von Oberl. Dr. E. Penner und C. Massey in London.—Mueller, Ad., Gottfried Gurcke, Englische Schulgrammatik. 1. Teil, Elementarbuch. Bearbeitet von Chr. Lindemann. 28. Auflage.—Mueller, Ad., Großes englisches Repetitorium. Für höhere Lehranstalten und zum Selbstunterricht. Von Chr. Joh. Deter, Dr. phil. 2. Auflage.—Mueller, Ad., Bernhard Teichmann, Praktische Methode für die englische Sprache. Eine unentbehrliche Ergänzung zu jedem englischen Lehrbuche.—Mueller, Ad., C. Kloepper, Englische Synonymik. Kleine Ausgabe für höhere Unterrichtsanstalten. 3. Auflage.—Velckerling, G., Auswahl englischer Gedichte für den Schulgebrauch, zusammengestellt von Ernst Gropp und Emil Hausknecht. 2. Auflage.—Mueller, Ad., Scenes from Old-Scottish Life (Aus The Maid of Perth) von Walter Scott. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Hugo Bahrs.—Mueller, Ad., Little Servants by Mrs. F. Prentiss u. s. w. Für den Schulgebrauch bearbeitet von B. Mühy.—Mueller, Ad., A Carol in Prose as arranged and read by Charles Dickens. Mit Anmerkungen u. s. w. herausgeg. von Dr. Heinrich Hupe.—Mueller, Ad., The English Intellect during the xvi., xvii. and xviii. Centuries by

Henry Thomas Buckle, herausgegeben von Dr. Heinrich Hupe.—Zusammenhängende Übersetzungsübungen im Anschluß an zwei Kapitel von Th. Buckles History of Civilisation u. s. w. zusammengestellt von Dr. Heinrich Hupe.—Z., J., The House of Martha. By Frank R. Stockton.—Z., J., 'La Bella' and Others, being certain Stories recollected by Egerton Castle.—Z., J., Constance. By F. C. Philips.—Z., J., The Three Fates. By F. Marion Crawford.—Z., J., 'But Men Must Work.' By Rosa Nouchette Carey.—Z., J., A Modern Dick Whittington. By James Payn.—Speyer, Fr., Études de Grammaire et de Littérature Françaises. Rédacteur en chef: Ph. Plattner. Ire. année. Nr. 1.—Tobler, Adolf, Sully Prudhomme, Réflexions sur l'Art des Vers.—Tobler, Adolf, Eugène d'Eichthal, Du Rythme dans la Versification française.—Tobler, Adolf, Robert de Souza, Questions de métrique. Le Rythme poétique.—Speyer, Fr., Lehr- und Lernbuch der französischen Sprache von J. Pünjer. Zweite, umgearbeitete Auflage.—Speyer, Fr., Laut- und Aussprache-Tafeln für den französischen Anfangsunterricht bearbeitet von Dr. Ernst Dannheisser und Karl Wimmer.—Speyer, Fr., Lehrgang der französischen Sprache für Kaufleute und Vorschule zur französischen Handelskorrespondenz (speziell zur *Correspondance commerciale per P. Brée*, 9. Auflage) von F. H. Schneitler. 2. Auflage.—Speyer, Fr., Materialien zum Übersetzen aus dem Deutschen ins Französische. Für obere Klassen höherer Lehranstalten. Von J. B. Peters. Zweite verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage.—Koschwitz, E., Carl Wahlund, Till Kvinnans lof. Ofversättningsfragment af L'Évangile des Femmes, en fornfransk dikt från sista tredjedelen af elfvåhundratalet. Med teckningar af Agl.—Tobler, Adolf, Carl Voretzsch, Über die Sage von Ogier dem Dänen und die Entstehung der Chevalerie Ogier, ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung des altfranzösischen Heldenepos.—Tobler, Adolf, Ernest Langlois, Origines et sources du Roman de la Rose.—Speyer, Fr., Perles de la Prose Française par Chrétien Guillaume Damour.—Speyer, Fr., Molière, Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme. Mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. C. Humbert.—Speyer, Fr., Le Siècle de Louis XIV. par Voltaire. Im Auszuge herausgeg. von Adolf Mager. Das Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV. bis zur Eroberung Hollands.—Speyer, Fr., Beaumarchais, Le Barbier de Séville. Mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen herausgegeben von Dr. Wilh. Knörich.—Speyer, Fr., Courage et Bon Cœur, Anecdotes du Temps de l'Empire par E. M. de St. Hilaire. Herausgeg. von Mme A. Brée. 7. Aufl. Durchgesehen und mit Wörterbuch zum Schulgebrauch herausgeg. von Prof. Dr. C. Th. Lion.—Speyer, Fr., Souvestre, Au Coin du Feu. Auswahl mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Humbert.—Speyer, Fr., Augier und Sandeau, Le Gendre de Monsieur Poirier. Mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. D. Mühlly.—Speyer, Fr., Octave Feuillet, Le Roman d'un jeune Homme pauvre. Im Auszug für den Schulgebrauch wie zum Selbstunterricht herausgegeben und mit Anmerkungen versehen von Mlle Constance Courvoisier.—Verzeichnis der vom 31. Mai bis zum 11. Juli 1892 bei der Redaktion eingelaufenen Druckschriften.